Tracing the Ideologies of State Language Roadmaps: A Discursive Analysis of Education, Economics and Equity in Language Policy

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Ashley Elizabeth Karlsson

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Peter Demerath, Advisor

May 2021

Acknowledgements

The work of a dissertation is truly a collaborative effort, and I am profoundly grateful to everyone who played a role in supporting me through this work. I would like to extend special gratitude to the following individuals and groups of people for their care and contributions in this endeavor.

To my advisor, Dr. Peter Demerath, and to my committee members, Dr. Katie Pekel, Dr. Fran Vavrus, Dr. Kendall King and Dr. Lori Helman, thank you for your steadfast encouragement and mentorship as I develop my sense of being as a practitioner-scholar. Your guidance and counsel have been an invaluable component of my development and I look forward to continuing to strive after the high standards you have set for me.

To the Executive PhD Cohort in Education Policy and Leadership, thank you for your friendship and collaboration as we navigated the PhD process together. I relish each moment of laughter and introspection, and I respect your willingness to ask the hard questions. I am grateful for the opportunity to learn from each of your experiences, and I am confident that our cohort will continue to transform the educational landscape in Minnesota and beyond.

To my colleagues at the Minnesota Regional Centers of Excellence, thank you for keeping me grounded in praxis through our work with schools and districts across the state. Your willingness to listen and critique has given me the encouragement I needed to keep moving forward in the midst of unprecedented uncertainty. I am honored to be part of a team that continues to engage in difficult conversations by centering equity throughout our decision-making processes.

To the rest of my professors at the University of Minnesota, thank you for challenging me to expand my thinking and for creating space in which to explore new perspectives. Our classes together inspired my curiosity and compelled me towards greater reflexivity. I cherish our provocative class discussions, especially as we grappled with what it means to be a transformative leader in education and policy development.

To each of the individuals who participated in interviews for this research, thank you for making time to talk with me in the midst of a tumultuous year. The insights and wisdom I gathered in dialogue with you have helped shape my evolving understandings of language policy in education. At times hesitant and guarded, and at other times, wildly and brutally candid, our conversations were openings into new and different ways of making meaning in the world.

To the critical scholars and practitioners that have come before me, thank you for your ceaseless ambition to question systems of power and privilege, even when you could not always access formal educational opportunities and titles for yourselves. The work of restructuring education systems is long overdue, and I want to recognize the long

tradition of activism that is not content with incremental change. I have cited the work of many scholars I admire and respect, and I also recognize that my references represent a small fraction of the efforts being made to advance more equitable educational systems.

This research study has been a source of tremendous personal and professional growth, and I hold in my heart the names and faces of those listed above along with many more who have contributed to my ongoing learning over the years. As I continue in my own journey as a practitioner-scholar, I hope to do justice to your belief in me by contributing what I can to make the world a better place. Any errors in the text remain my own.

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to my family.

To my twin sister, Amy Fettig, who has been with me from the beginning to make sure I was never alone. And to my parents, Cindy and Wes Arends, who have loved me unconditionally and who have always been the first to celebrate my successes along the way, no matter how small.

I love you most.

Abstract

Over the last fifteen years, the Language Flagship, an initiative of the National Security Education Program (NSEP), has been working with education, business, and government partners to draft state language roadmaps in support of advancing multilingualism. So far, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Rhode Island, Hawai‘i, Wisconsin and Indiana have published roadmaps with the support of NSEP. While these language roadmaps ostensibly position multilingualism as a benefit to society, there has been limited research on the language ideologies that undergird the policy proposals present in these documents. This research study draws on several qualitative data sources, including the text of current language roadmaps, ancillary artifacts related to each state roadmap initiative, and interviews with key state actors who participated in the drafting of these roadmaps to conduct a critical discourse analysis of how particular language ideologies are reproduced in language education policy. The findings of this study demonstrate convergence across several themes, including sense-making around language awareness and conscientization, the reproduction of neoliberal discourse through the language of economics and the positioning of equity within the language roadmaps. The language ideologies and orientations present in these findings provide a point of reference for interpreting the policy proposals put forth in each roadmap. Ultimately, the recommendations offered by each state roadmap establishes a particular vision of multilingualism, including who is expected to benefit from specific policy efforts. This study is significant for its potential to guide language policy actors across multiple levels

in drafting, revising and implementing state policies that respond to evolving discourse on equity and attend more directly to issues of language access and opportunity.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

The first time I saw a south-up map was in a high school social studies classroom. Chances are, it was probably one of the classic South World maps with a Van der Grinten projection (Wood et al., 2006). Whatever the design, I remember being jarred by the image that twisted my own assumptions upside-down. Maps are, by their very nature, a political statement. They paint a picture of the world as it is, or at least as it is through the eyes of the cartographer. The placement of borders and boundaries, the names given to particular places, the relative size and shape ascribed to particular communities, and the orientation of the map itself all reflect a particular way of viewing the world. Through encounters with a multitude of diverse representations over time, I have come to understand that not everyone is alike in the way we view the world. And our viewings of the world are shaped by a multitude of forces that are dynamic, complex and worthy of deeper investigation. It is no surprise then, that when I first stumbled upon a language roadmap, a rush of questions came flooding back to me. By whom and for whom were these language roadmaps designed? What particular view of the world did they espouse? And what forces shaped the development of these roadmaps? In the chapters that follow, I hope to take the readers on a journey that traces the development of state-level language roadmaps and explores the themes and patterns within them through a deeper analysis of the connections and influences that contoured their contents.

Historicizing Language Roadmaps

Over the course of the last fifteen years, eight states (Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Rhode Island, Hawai‘i, Wisconsin and Indiana) have published state-level language

roadmaps through the Language Flagship. The Language Flagship is an initiative of the National Security Education Program (NSEP). The primary mission of NSEP, as stated on their website, is "to develop a pipeline of foreign language and culture expertise for the U.S. federal government workforce" (NSEP Homepage, n.d.). The Language Flagship supports this goal through the design and implementation of language education programming in partnership with education, business and government leaders (NSEP Initiatives, n.d.). The language roadmap initiatives sponsored by NSEP represent one strategy for articulating a state-level vision and goals related to multilingualism. The first set of language roadmaps were published in 2007, while the most recent roadmap initiative was completed in 2019. In the broader language education policy arena, the publication of these roadmaps can be situated within other policy endeavors like No Child Left Behind (2001) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (2015) as well as with other language-specific policies outlined in Appendix A.

At the time of this writing, there are no additional roadmaps under development through the Language Flagship, but there is ongoing engagement in several of the states with published roadmaps and anecdotal evidence of additional states engaging in similar policy efforts. While the first few roadmap initiatives were based predominantly on existing relationships with the Language Flagship, the most recent roadmap initiatives were funded in part through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process (*See Appendix B: Request for Proposals*). The selection criteria for this most recent RFP includes a focus on integrating education, business and government while also attending to technical details such as leadership, timeline, execution and institutional commitment (Language

Flagship, 2017). The objectives articulated in the RFP include identifying local language needs, identifying strategies for increasing language capacity within government, business and education, increasing public understanding around language and increasing the number of multilingual graduates (Language Flagship, 2017).

The objectives of the language roadmap initiatives described in the RFP are clearly aligned with the stated goals of the published language roadmaps, which emphasize increasing linguistic and cultural knowledge as well as more specific goals around student bilingualism. Oregon (2007) set the goal of professional proficiency in English and functional proficiency in another language for all graduates in 2025; Texas (2007) identified an objective of "advanced linguistic and cultural proficiency in a language other than English" by 2027 (p. vi); and the Rhode Island (2012) roadmap lays out a vision for the majority of graduates to be "proficient in English and at least one other language" by 2030 (p. i). All of the roadmaps make claims about the importance of multilingualism. Benefits related to workforce development and economic competitiveness figure prominently across the language roadmaps, an affinity which is explored in more detail in Chapter 5. Many roadmaps also advance claims about the value of multilingualism in relation to national security.

Connections to National Security

The connections to national security issues in the language roadmaps is largely unsurprising given their inauguration. The development of each of the language roadmaps was supported by a diverse group of government, education and business leaders, in addition to sponsorship from the Language Flagship. According to the

Language Flagship website (n.d.), the goal of these roadmaps is to "develop the multilingual workforce necessary for American economic competitiveness and *national security*" (*emphasis added*). As previously stated, the Language Flagship is an initiative of the National Security Education Program (NSEP), an organization signed into law by President George H.W. Bush in 1991 with the goal of investing in languages and cultures critical to national security (NSEP History, n.d.; U.S. Code 50, 90 et seq.). The National Security Education Program was established by Congress in the 1990s out of fear that lack of proficiency in languages deemed critical for national security would indeed endanger the safety of our nation (Brecht & Rivers, 2012). NSEP is a part of the Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO) and is officially administered by the U.S. Secretary of Defense, who also oversees the U.S. Department of Defense. This shared administration is significant because the U.S. Department of Defense published their own language policy roadmap two years prior to the first publication of a state language roadmap (Brecht & Rivers, 2012).

The Defense Language Transformation Roadmap, published in January 2005, outlines strategic planning goals and required actions to increase the language capacity of the U.S. Department of Defense. The roadmap makes the case for increasing departmental language capacity by stating that "Language skill and regional expertise are not valued as Defense core competencies, yet they are as important as *critical weapon systems*" (DOD, 2005, p. 3, *emphasis added*). The Defense Language Transformation Roadmap explicitly assumes a need for increasing language capacity based in part on "conflict against enemies speaking less-commonly-taught languages" as well as

"security, humanitarian, nation-building, and stability operations" (DOD, 2005, p. 3). There is a very clear emphasis on the value of language as a "tactical, operational, and strategic asset" (DOD, 2005, p. 4). The required actions within the roadmap include myriad technical and adaptive strategies, including standardizing military language codes, improving testing and screening for personnel, and supporting implementation of the National Flagship Language Initiative. Taken together, the strategies focus on identifying language needs, assessing current capacity, and strengthening pathways and programs towards multilingualism. Absent the heavy military focus, these strategies share remarkable similarities with the trajectory and outcomes of the state-level language roadmaps reviewed for this study.

Language Roadmap Initiatives

The design and development of each of the state language roadmaps followed a pattern that was eminently similar across each of the states. Work on the language roadmaps began with data collection and research that explored the linguistic profile, or language needs, of each state. With funding from the Language Flagship and available research in hand, the initiative coordinators convened state-wide Language Summits that included representatives from state universities, local businesses and state and local government officials. These Language Summits provided participants with an opportunity to review available research and brainstorm a new vision, mission and goals for multilingualism within their state. Based on the work that was initiated during the Language Summit in each state, working groups were convened to continue conversations and draft recommendations for the language roadmap. The working group

recommendations were eventually compiled and organized for publication into the language roadmaps documents available today. With some slight differences in their organization, most of the language roadmaps present an executive summary of the work, followed by a portrait of multilingualism in the state, a mission or vision for multilingualism in the future, and recommendations or proposals to enact changes in policy and practice.

A comparison of the recommendations offered by each of the states (*See Appendix C*) illustrates many similarities along with some unique differences. All states described a plan for public outreach and dissemination of information related to multilingualism and introduced strategies for extending opportunities and sequences of language study. Most of the roadmaps highlighted opportunities to develop and expand teacher training programs and sought to encourage study abroad opportunities for students in high school or college and to create opportunities for student internships that allow for the development and application of language skills. Other recommendations that generated significant attention across multiple language roadmaps include incentives for innovative or model language programs, enhanced diplomas, the development of online resources for language instruction and the development of a coordinating entity to ensure implementation of the language roadmap recommendations. In addition to these examples of alignment, there were also some unique recommendations offered in some of the roadmaps. Hawai‘i (2013) proposed a separate language-based visa category to encourage international workers; Oregon (2007) and Utah (2009) recommended tax incentives for families that host international exchange students; and Texas (2007)

advanced the idea of a "Language Corps" that would provide tuition reimbursement to students in exchange for a commitment to language-based public service. Apart from some of these standalone examples, many of the recommendations listed in the roadmaps align with policy recommendations that can be traced back decades. Extending sequences of language education, a recommendation in all eight roadmaps can be traced back to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (1979).

Factors Influencing Roadmap Convergence and Divergence

The convergence evident between the language roadmap initiatives and the resulting roadmap publications across each of the eight states can be traced in part to required alignment with the RFP, the use of shared consultants across the initiatives, and direct and indirect collaboration between states. These factors can be described with reference to coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Glazier & Hall, 1996). Because the language roadmap initiatives emerged in direct response to the program objectives of the Language Flagship, there is necessary concordance between the roadmaps in the degree to which they advance a similar set of goals. Coercive isomorphism refers to the ways in which formal and informal pressures lead institutions towards homogeneity. These pressures can be based on resource dependency or on a particular set of expectations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Glazier & Hall, 1996). The dependence on funding from NSEP led to external pressure, or coercive isomorphism, to reinforce the goals of Language Flagship across all of the initiatives.

The novelty of the roadmap process necessarily created uncertainty which was often remediated through mimetic isomorphism. Through mimetic isomorphism,

institutions mirror and model the structures and practices of other established institutions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Glazier & Hall, 1996). Whether directly through collaboration and conversation with other roadmap states, or indirectly through the review of previously published exemplars, state language roadmaps mirrored a number of similar policy proposals. Finally, the Language Flagship provided funding and access to consultants to support the roadmap process in each state, which created convergence through normative isomorphism. Normative isomorphism is based on the similar socialization of professionals. The diffusion of ideas in normative isomorphism can also happen indirectly through employee turnover and transfer (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Glazier & Hall, 1996). As individuals move within and between certain settings, they bring with them particular ways of doing and being. The movement of consultants between states resulted in normative isomorphism as the consultants carried similar strategies and methods between states. Coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism are helpful frames for explaining convergence across the language roadmaps, while also recognizing that there are political consequences to how the process of policy convergence is narrated (Schwegler, 2011).

Divergence between the roadmap initiatives and published roadmaps can be explained through multiple contextual factors, including geographic, economic, and demographic characteristics, as well as differences in sociopolitical context and leadership. With reference to geography, smaller states like Rhode Island were able to organize the work centrally, whereas larger states like Indiana took a more regional approach. Because business played a significant role as a stakeholder in the roadmap

initiative process, the presence of multinational companies and international trading arrangements within each state influenced the emphasis on particular languages within each plan. State demographics also played a role in how certain strategies were articulated. The Hawai‘i Language Roadmap placed a great deal of emphasis on support for the indigenous Hawaiian language, while the Texas roadmap placed greater attention on heritage Spanish speakers. The sociopolitical context in which each state roadmap was drafted also contributed to differences in each document. The roadmap initiatives spanned three presidencies, an economic recession, and multiple changes to state and federal education policy. The principal investigators and coordinators of this work also diverged in their own personal and professional experiences with language and language education.

Implementation of Roadmap Recommendations

As state policy documents, the language roadmaps outlined strategies and recommendations for advancing multilingualism. While they included significant stakeholder input from education, business and government leaders, the documents themselves lack the weight of law required to implement certain initiatives. Without legally enforceable provisions, the implementation of language roadmap recommendations demonstrated significant variation both within and across states. Certain initiatives did seem to achieve appreciable success across multiple states. The development and promotion of enhanced diplomas through state seals of bilingualism and biliteracy was common across many of the roadmaps while other strategies, like the Language Corps in Texas or language education bonds in Oregon did not gain much

traction in actual implementation. In some states, concurrent state initiatives related to language education make it difficult to disentangle the degree to which the roadmaps played a role in realizing certain changes. In the case of more recent roadmaps like Indiana and Wisconsin, the implementation success of certain strategies is yet to be seen.

Researcher Positionality

My interest in language roadmaps stems in part from a set of conversations with other educational leaders and researchers regarding the state of multilingualism in Minnesota. Beginning in 2018, a local non-profit initiated a professional network centered on multilingual learners. As the network grappled with its own purpose and direction, one of the topics that garnered significant attention was the concept of a language roadmap. Our neighboring state of Wisconsin had just published their own language roadmap and the group began to raise questions about the feasibility of developing a similar language policy and planning document. While the group conversations about a language roadmap for Minnesota eventually faded because of internal capacity and competing priorities, it became clear to me through those meetings that there is interest from various organizations in exploring the possibility of a language roadmap for Minnesota. The network meetings also elucidated for me the opportunities and challenges that might exist for future attempts at creating a roadmap. Even within a small group of committed stakeholders, views on what should or should not be included in a language roadmap for Minnesota illustrated clear differences in perspective. Based on these reflections, I learned that any attempt at a state level language policy would surely raise questions about perspectives, values and goals.

My own beliefs about language and multilingualism have been shaped by a variety of experiences throughout my life. As a student in high school and college, I found value in studying languages deemed 'foreign'. The small, rural town I grew up in was home to predominantly monolingual English speakers, and I relished the opportunity to learn different ways of thinking and being through language. Professionally, the majority of my career has been focused on multilingual learners. As a licensed English as a Second Language teacher, I spent seven years working directly with multilingual students identified as English Learners in U.S. schools. My own understandings about language and culture have grown significantly since my first years as a teacher, owing in part to the experiences I had with my students and in part to my ongoing studies in the field of language education. Learning more about the historical harm that has been inflicted through English imperialism and the subtractive practices that have often characterized language education have compelled me to reflect more critically on the ways in which my role as an educator contributes to the reproduction of particular language ideologies. It is through this critical and reflective lens that I explore the state language roadmaps discussed in this paper.

Significance of the Study

In order to understand why a study of language roadmaps is relevant for education leaders and other language policy arbiters, it is important to establish a clear picture of the affordances of multilingualism and the inequitable ways in which the benefits of multilingualism are allocated in society. Despite well-established research on the benefits of multilingualism, education spaces in the United States continue to be oriented toward

the reproduction of monolingualism as the norm (Cook & Bassetti, 2011; Gogolin, 2013, Motha, 2014). While multilingualism may be celebrated for economic purposes or for the advancement of national security, multilingual students with legal status as English Learners are frequently pathologized through institutional labels that function as proxies for race-based othering (Motha, 2014). Even when multilingual students develop language skills deemed proficient under government policies, they continue to bear labels as "former English Learners" and the ever present "non-native English speaker". The dichotomous views of language taken up by schools, and by society writ large, are drawn from linguistic ideologies steeped in colonialism and its associated epistemology (Fanon, 1967). Binary views of language proficiency and identity conceal the strengths and skills of young people (Lam & Warriner, 2012) and contribute to ongoing inequalities for students and other individuals from marginalized linguistic backgrounds (Motha, 2014).

Despite the linguistic dexterity of multilingual students, students learning English are often constructed as deficient (Motha, 2014; Flores & Rosa, 2015) and language differences are often framed as educational obstacles and deficiencies (Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009; Shapiro, 2014). This pathologization is especially salient for language varieties that are not associated with whiteness (Motha, 2014). Research has demonstrated that language practices are viewed differently if they are animated by a racialized student or a privileged white student (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Even when using standardized forms of English, racialized students may still be perceived as using nonstandard forms of language. Flores and Rosa (2015) write that the "social positions of

different language users, rather than simply their linguistic repertoires, impact how their linguistic practices are heard" (p. 162).

The education of multilingual learners is therefore entangled and enmeshed in historical conditions and dynamics of race and power (Viesca et al., 2019). Even a cursory look at data demonstrates that schools in the United States educate students differentially. Multilingual students identified as English Learners are less successful in school than students not identified as English Learners (Motha, 2014; Shapiro, 2014). Learning opportunities for multilingual learners are often impeded by the assumptions of monolingual teachers (Gogolin, 2013). Because English proficiency is often assumed to be a prerequisite for rigorous courses, multilingual learners are often systematically denied access to such courses (Shapiro, 2014). Lack of access to rigorous courses can have severe implications for future educational opportunities. Multilingual learners have less participation in post-secondary education, not as a result of their language proficiency, but because of inequitable experiences and opportunities in school (Motha, 2014). Even bilingual programs designed specifically to meet the needs of linguistically marginalized students find themselves subject to the hegemony of normative monolingualism and often place constructed boundaries on which languages are spoken in which spaces and at which times (Fuller, 2009; Durán & Palmer, 2014).

Immigrant bilingualism is frequently stigmatized while elite bilingualism is seen as prestigious (Fuller, 2009; Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009). In a study of bilingualism in New Zealand, Major (2018) called attention to the ways in which home language use in the classroom was "predominantly covert and unsanctioned by teachers, used for social

purposes and to clarify task requirements, but generally not in service of conceptual development" (p. 204). Addressing the marginalization of multilingual learners requires continued examination of the ideologies and beliefs that reinforce discourses of deficit as well as the institutional practices and policies that reproduce those values. As Flores (2020) writes, "To focus solely on linguistic solutions places the onus on racialized communities to undo their own oppression through the modification of their language practices" (p. 29). Confronting the policies and practices that marginalize multilingual learners needs to address the roles of state and federal language policy and the ideological structures (re)produced within them. By examining the discourse present in language roadmaps, this study calls into question the naturalized assumptions used to advance multilingualism and contributes greater understanding to how language ideologies impact the differential design and beneficiaries of language education policy.

Research Questions

As described in the section above, linguistic inequities are an undeniable component of our current educational reality. Despite ongoing marginalization for certain linguistic groups, affirmative rhetoric on multilingualism has been taken up in official and unofficial ways by government institutions. Over the last fifteen years, state-level language roadmaps, sponsored by the Language Flagship, have laid out a plan to increase multilingualism within the states that have produced them. Ostensibly, these language roadmaps should position multilingualism as a benefit to society, but to date, no significant research has been published on the language ideologies that undergird the

messaging in these documents. In support of a critical, ideological analysis of these state-level language roadmaps, the research questions addressed in this study include:

A. What language ideologies exist in the text of language roadmaps?
B. What discourses exist surrounding the language roadmaps and their development?
C. How are these discourses and language ideologies evident in policy proposals?

Organization of the Study

To explore the research questions presented above, this paper draws from the fields of language policy and planning and discourse analysis, both of which are taken up in greater detail in the following chapters. Chapter 2 presents the literature and theoretical framing used to guide this study and Chapter 3 outlines the methods and methodology for data collection and analysis, including additional details about study limitations. The findings of this research are divided into three chapters, Chapters 4, 5 and 6, which focus respectively on public education and conscientization around language, the reproduction of neoliberalism through the language of economics, and the presence and absence of equity within the roadmaps. Chapter 7 concludes by summarizing the preceding chapters and offers recommendations for how the findings could be used by language policy actors who may be interested in drafting or revising their own language roadmaps and by other educational leaders, including classroom teachers, who may be interested in engaging with language ideologies as policymakers within their own local terrain.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In order to develop a deeper understanding of how language roadmaps (re)produce particular language ideologies, the theoretical framing for this study draws on scholarship that historicizes language planning and policy, identifies potential orientations towards language, and establishes the relationship between language and society. This literature review is centered around an ecological model of language use. Ecological thinking reckons with the relationships and interactions between objects and their environment as well as the overall health of the environment (Mühlhäusler, 2012). Within the field of linguistics, an ecological model assumes that language diversity is essential for society (Tollefson, 2010). This study assumes that diversity is an essential element of any community and that understanding the interrelations between educational policies and the language ideologies in and around them is a complex task. The literature presented here is organized within this ecological orientation both to recognize the dynamic situation of language in local practices and to appreciate the relationships between all things and beings (Davis, 2014, Canagarajah, 2018). In the same way that ecolinguistics recognizes the complexities of language systems and seeks to move beyond simple, universal solutions (Mühlhäusler, 2012), this paper approaches the analysis of language ideologies through an ecological framework that privileges critical reflection on the interconnectedness and co-construction of language policy and discourse. After a brief overview of language ideology and the principles of language policy and planning, this review offers a theoretical framework for understanding

language, followed by a critical approach to discourse analysis and an examination of potential connections to other social theories that can be reflected through language.

Language Policy and Planning

Historically, language policy and planning (LPP) became widely recognized and identifiable as a field in part because of macro sociopolitical forces. Tracing back to the 1950s, Hornberger (2015) explains that the first few decades of LPP research focused attention on structural issues in decolonization and state formation. Early approaches were centered on status planning that emphasized linguistic homogeneity through formal education in colonial languages such as English or French (Ricento, 2000). In the early days of LPP, official status was given to languages that were "written, standardized, and adaptable to the demands of technological and social advancement" (Ricento, 2000, p. 198). Early views on LPP approached language education from a technical, pragmatic orientation (Ricento, 2000). This technocratic view largely ignored the question of politics and dismissed fundamental questions about who might benefit or not from such policies, such as English-only policies in K-12 education classrooms. Early studies of language policy and planning were dominated by taxonomies and dichotomies (Ricento, 2000) and have more recently been criticized for their failure to address social and political contexts (Tollefson, 2010).

As the field evolved, prescriptive linguistic paradigms were called into question, critiques of modernization ushered in a growing awareness of the ways in which LPP contributed to ongoing inequality (Ricento, 2000) and more recently, increasing transnational movement has drawn greater attention to issues of power, agency, identity

and rights. The evolvement of the field over time has led to an assemblage of methodological tools and approaches. The early 21st century saw a growing trend within LPP to analyze the role of ideology in language policy. Continuing immigration and displacement worldwide have led to renewed academic interest in the field, with increased attention on sociopolitical and ideological concerns in recent years (Tollefson, 2010). Interest in language planning and policy will likely continue to increase as a result of contemporary processes of globalization and migration (Jernudd & Nekvapil, 2012).

A cursory review of LPP recognizes the ways in which the organizational field has been implicated historically in the spread of hegemonic language ideologies through linguistic imperialism (Lo Bianco, 2010; Tollefson, 2010). Examples of this linguistic imperialism include the naturalization of English as a language of prestige and idealizations of native speaker instructors in language education contexts. With this significant criticism of the field in mind, LPP can be helpful in demonstrating the ways in which conceptualizations of language are impacted by various social and political forces. Any recommendations for LPP must be viewed as situational within time and space. Historically, language planning is an opportunity for decision making not only about matters of linguistics but also about matters of politics (Jernudd & Nekvapil, 2012). While language policy documents have political value, that value will shift as languaging practices and the coeval social milieu continue to shift as well. The study of language policy therefore requires a careful balance between the power dynamics inherent in policy and agential possibilities inherent in policy interpretation and implementation (Johnson & Johnson, 2015). By acknowledging the evolution of LPP, I hope to situate

my work within the domain of scholars that question the relationship between institutional language policies and hegemonic power structures while also recognizing language as a dynamic social practice that is full of agential potential.

Domains of Language Policy and Planning

There are three significant domains of language policy and planning that interact within the ecology of education: status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning (Hornberger, 2006; Spolsky, 2012). Together these domains shed light on how certain varieties of English have been standardized through ideologically driven, assimilationist language policies (Ricento, 2000) and each domain individually offers a helpful heuristic for understanding the evolution of myriad languaging practices across social and political spheres.

The first domain of language planning, status planning, refers to the ways in which particular languages or language varieties are selected for dissemination and use (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). This includes how certain roles and functions are allocated to specific languages and the prestige given to those language roles (Lo Bianco, 2010). In the educational ecology, status planning impacts which language(s) might be positioned as the medium of instruction and how the multiple languages that exist within U.S. schools might be leveraged or marginalized. The choice of which language(s) to offer in a dual immersion program or the language(s) selected for 'world language' or 'heritage language' courses can be related directly or indirectly to status planning.

The second domain, corpus planning, refers to how particular languages are codified and standardized (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Historically, the corpus plans

developed by linguists seldom worked in practice because they faced complex and continually changing community pressures (Spolsky, 2012). The dynamic nature of corpus planning has led some scholars, like Spolsky (2012), to prefer 'language management' over 'language planning'. The current standardization of 'academic language', even though there may not be a single unified plan, is an example of how certain linguistic features are socially coded through the principles of corpus planning. As with earlier efforts in LPP that led to the marginalization of languaging practices beyond prescriptive standardizations, the use of 'academic language' contributes to the ongoing linguistic marginalization of students in U.S. schools who speak language varieties beyond the standardized, hegemonic version of English.

The third domain of language planning, acquisition planning, references the ways in which languages are to be taught and the mechanisms used to support that process (Lo Bianco, 2010). Examples of acquisition planning in the United States would be the federal requirements for annual English language proficiency testing that pressure schools to teach English in a certain way and state standards in English Language Arts that emphasize particular forms of language use. The language education programming recommendations referenced throughout the roadmaps, including expanded sequences of language study and opportunities for international exchange also represent examples of how acquisition planning can attend to language education beyond English. Together, these three domains, status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning can be used to categorize the types of policy proposals put forth in relation to language. Each of

these domains, and the resulting language policy and planning recommendations are in turn informed by specific orientations towards language.

Language Orientations

Ruiz (1984) proposed three distinct orientations for LPP: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. At the national level, the language-as-problem orientation focused on identifying technical solutions to language development challenges. These solutions often involved the standardization or stratification of a particular language or languages. Within schools, the language-as-problem orientation can be seen in programming that pathologizes emerging bilinguals as students with cultural and linguistic deficits that need to be fixed. The language-as-resource orientation views language as a resource that can be developed, maintained or destroyed. Originally, the language-as-resource orientation was seen by some schools and other institutions as a way to enhance the status of marginalized languages, but there is a growing body of scholarship that critiques instrumental views of multilingualism (Valdez et al., 2016). The language-as-right orientation advocates for language as a basic human right. The right to language includes both freedom from discrimination and freedom to use language by choice. The benefits of bilingualism related to legal compliance, including equitable access to educational, legal, and medical services which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, fall under the language-as-right orientation (Ruiz, 1984).

Scholarship since Ruiz (1984) has continued to expand our understanding of language orientations and ideologies. With reference to the naturalization of certain language orientations, McGroarty (2012) writes that "[L]inguists and applied linguistics

have begun to recognize that 'common sense' views about language, whatever their source and whatever their degree of accuracy, must be taken seriously in the realm of civil discourse and public policy" (p. 91). McGroarty (2012) highlights the complexities of orientations towards language and builds on the orientations proposed by Ruiz (1984) by including additional orientations of language as refuge (emotional resonance) and resistance (social-psychological). Language orientations are closely related to language ideologies, which are described below with specific attention to the hegemony of English.

Language Ideologies and the Hegemony of English

Language ideologies can be defined as beliefs about language that guide behavior around language (Ajsic & McGroarty, 2015; Lam & Warriner, 2012). This section overviews the essentials of language ideologies and examines how English monolingualism has been positioned as the norm within the United States (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). While there are many different definitional perspectives on the nature of ideology in general, Woolard (1998) defines language ideology as the explicit and implicit representations "that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world" (p. 3). Dominant language ideologies are a necessary consideration in both the development and implementation of language policies (Wiley & Lukes, 1999). Language ideologies can be said to "envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology" (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). Beliefs about language can be mutually reinforcing, or they can compete with one another, a paradox which is highlighted through the convergent and divergent language ideologies presented as part of the findings in Chapters 4 and 5.

Although the hegemony of English is well established, it is not a necessary given. The hegemony of any particular ideology or discourse is a continual and dynamic process involving many agents. The normative positioning of monolingualism, often referenced by scholars as monoglossic language ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) has opened space for the unfettered perpetuation of the hegemony of English. Even within the field of language teaching, professional discourse has been dominated by monolingual thinking and has tended towards assumptions of an idealized native speaker (Leung & Valdés, 2019), a myth which ignores differences in the power and prestige of regional and class dialects (Rajagopalan, 1999). Within the United States, and in an increasing number of countries around the world, English has been positioned as the norm and any divergence from standardized forms of English is viewed as deficit (Shapiro, 2014). Even though standardized English cannot be described through objective or empirical linguistic categorizations, normative monolingualism centered on a particular social construction of English has clear and present hegemonic power (Fuller, 2009) that is regularly reinforced by individual and institutional discourse.

The privileging of certain social languages can be seen through linguistic imperialism and colonialism. The English language, itself made up of many different social languages, was privileged above other language varieties in the United States as a result of settler colonialism. English colonizers made systematic efforts to denigrate and eradicate Indigenous languages and continue to marginalize languages beyond English through both policy and practice. In the 20th century, approaches to teaching English were largely informed by nationalistic language ideologies (Flores, 2013), and the

hegemony of English was subsequently normalized within schools (Orellana & García, 2014). The consolidation of mass media by a handful of multinational corporations represents an ongoing conduit of linguistic imperialism and colonization (Ricento, 2000). Critical whiteness studies suggest that whiteness is often taken as the unmarked norm "against which all Others are racially and culturally defined, marked, and made inferior" (Kubota & Lin, 2019, p. 483). Within the United States, monolingualism, namely English monolingualism, is likewise taken to be the invisible norm against which other language orientations are judged. In order to move towards valuing multilingualism, we must first acknowledge how the unmarkedness of monolingualism leads to the marginalization of languages beyond English.

Language ideologies play an important role in education spaces because they can directly inform attitudes and investment in teaching and learning (Darvin & Norton, 2014). Increasing diversity in the ecology of languages has begun to call into question monoglossic language ideologies and the normative dichotomy often ascribed to the 'languages' of bilinguals (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). Current educational policy, however, continues to reflect hegemonic language ideologies, even in bilingual programs which are not immune to monoglossic language ideologies (Ricento, 2000; Leung & Valdés, 2019). Despite efforts to hold space for minoritized languages and multilingual language practices, hegemonic monoglossic ideologies can even be found in the most well-intentioned of bilingual schools (Fuller, 2009). For English speakers learning to speak Spanish, bilingual programs are positioned as a resource for enrichment, but for Spanish speakers learning to speak English, the same programs are positioned as a

solution to a problem (Johnson & Johnson, 2015). Language diversity within bilingual programs can be silenced even when there are strong narratives of multiculturalism and diversity (Major, 2018). Rosa (2016) writes that "The linguistic dexterity of racially minoritized populations such as Latinas/os is perpetually devalued in the context of a U.S. monolingual hegemony" (p. 165).

Within the English language, a particular variety of languaging practices, namely those associated with a particular kind of exclusionary schooling, have been and continue to be privileged under the terms "Standard English" or academic English. Wiley and Lukes (1999) write that "The longevity and persistence of English testing policies through the educational system as mechanisms for tracking and gatekeeping are evidence for the hegemony and centrality of standard English ideology in education" (p. 526). The imperialism of English can be analyzed in both structural and ideological terms. Structural dominance can be seen in the economic, financial and military power of English and ideological hegemony can be seen in the social discourses that accompany English as a language of access, success and cosmopolitanism (Phillipson, 2006). In order for alternative ideologies to be animated, the ideological power of the current language policies and practices needs to be weakened (Clemens & Cook, 1999). Rejecting monolingualism as the norm requires shifting to a heteroglossic perspective that values the simultaneous operation of multiple language systems (Poza, 2017). Heteroglossic language ideologies disrupt traditional views of bilingualism and language policy and can be seen clearly through the theoretical framework of assemblage which is discussed in the following section.

Assemblage in Language Education and Policy

Recognizing the dynamic nature of multilingualism involves shifting from static conceptualizations of language and bilingualism to more dynamic theorizations. The complexities of shifting to a more responsive language ideology can be supported through the conceptualization of assemblage. An assemblage includes all of the human and non-human actors connected to one another. Within schools, the teaching assemblage includes the teachers, students, instructional practices, and material resources as well as the historical context and present policies at the school, district and national level (Viesca et al., 2019). In policy spaces, an assemblage may include the policymakers themselves, the published policy text, artifacts that were generated over the course of the policy process, the arbiters responsible for policy implementation, the constituents affected by policy, and the historical conditions in which the policy was constructed. Ideas, spaces and power dynamics can all be crucial elements of an assemblage.

The concept of assemblage can be seen in the complex interdependence of language ideology and institutional policy and practice. Appreciating the connections and relationships within and between the actors in an assemblage is important not only for analyzing policy as it is, but also for supporting the production of policy as it should be. To understand an assemblage like language policy is to understand how discursive and non-material elements can come together to shape a thing. There is a dynamic, nonlinear and temporary nature to an assemblage which recognizes how the aggregate actions of people and things within an assemblage continually shape and are shaped by the extant conditions. As Koyama and Vareene (2012) write, an assemblage "focuses analytic

attention on how disparate material and discursive practices come together to form dynamic associations" (p. 157). Analyzing policy, therefore, is not just about examining a particular text, but about understanding the policy assemblage as a space of contested power. Anytime a policy moves between sites, there is space for productive interaction and shifting boundaries. Koyama and Varenne (2012) refer to this space as 'productive policy play'. The next section looks more closely at the intersections between language, policy, and the power dynamics inherent in shifting beliefs and practices about language.

Intersection of Language, Politics and Power

A central concept to the understanding of language is that languages are not neutral (Lo Bianco, 2010; Ives, 2010). The language we use creates a particular perspective on what is considered 'normal' or not (Gee, 2005). This perspective-taking, which is inherently political, is an indispensable part of language. By using language, we are taking up particular points of view within the word. While Western-dominant patterns of scientific thinking presume a transcendent positionality from which to speak and write about the world, the notion of objectivity is undermined by the linguistic necessity of perspective. Likewise, language policies are not objective or apolitical but are imbued with ideology, value and power. Power itself is not always binary, but situational and relational. There are different contestations of politics and power in play depending on the context being studied, including the context of language learning (Ives, 2010).

Politics is defined by Gee (2005) as "how social goods are thought about, argued over and distributed in society" (p. 2). The social goods that he refers to can include anything that is believed to be a source of value, power or status. Language education,

therefore, is political in every sense of the word. As Gee (2011) writes, “The mastery, use, and maintenance of languages, dialects, sign systems and ways of knowing the world are, for the people who “own” them, social goods” (p. 136). It is the distribution of social goods that forms the foundation of politics. Language education is inherently political because it ensures that the social goods of language are distributed in particular ways to certain groups of people. This relates in part to the Bourdieusian concept of capital (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991). Certain languages offer symbolic capital, and without those languages, access to power can be restricted (Fuller, 2009). As Rajagopalan (1999) writes, “There is violence in language because human relations are fraught with power inequalities” (p. 203). The English language in particular has been fraught with conflict and contested meanings on the global landscape. Some define English as a language of opportunity while others define it as a means of ongoing coloniality and inequality (Motha, 2014). In the past, English was made dominant through coercive governmental methods. Today, the linguistic imperialism of English continues through transnational media, commerce and other international organizations. Teaching English, therefore, is a highly political endeavor (Motha, 2014).

Darvin and Norton (2014) write, “As a social practice, language learning is implicated in relations of power” (p. 56). All teachers must recognize that teaching in and about English is much more than just teaching a language (Rajagopalan, 1999). The power relations within and between languages has resulted in a hierarchy of language in which certain languages and language varieties are considered more correct than others (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). This hierarchy, however, is often camouflaged by discourses

of naturalness and commonsense. When schools, government and businesses reinforce the role of English as a lingua franca, the ideologies that undergird that messaging are often left unchecked. As Shore et al. (2011) write, "The most effective way to disguise power is by making a particular discourse appear so 'natural' that its ideological content comes to be regarded as common sense and therefore beyond question" (p. 171). Questioning the hegemony of English is disruptive to the hierarchy of the current language ecology, but it is a necessary step in understanding the language ideologies that are continually reproduced in policy. The following section looks at one example of how language policy intersects with politics and power at the national level.

Language Policy and National Security

The most significant investment in language policy and planning from the federal government is not in the U.S. Department of State nor the U.S. Department of Education, as one might assume, but rather in national security through the Department of Defense (Brecht & Rivers, 2012). Brecht and Rivers (2012) write that the "U.S. Department of Education has yet to take up strong educational initiatives in support of state, local and other federal efforts, and this remains a significant deficiency in U.S. language policy" (p. 277). When it comes to adjudicating discourses of language ideology and language policy, it is clear that the monopoly on coercive power still falls to the nation-state (Lam & Warriner, 2012). Language policy remains a practical concern for the construction of the modern nation-state (Brecht & Rivers, 2012).

In their historicization of language policy and national security, Brecht and Rivers (2012) discuss how foreign language teaching was prohibited in the wake of World War

I, reinstituted because of military needs during World War II, and then amplified during the Cold War and following 9/11. There has been a historical connection between English and ideals of patriotism (Wiley & Lukes, 1999). This link can also be seen in the discrimination of German speakers during and after WWI, the persecution of Japanese speakers during WWII and in overt acts of prejudice and bigotry against Arabic speakers after 9/11. Rosa (2016) writes that "Standardized American English should be conceptualized as a raciolinguistic ideology that aligns normative whiteness, legitimate Americanness, and imagined ideal English" (p. 165).

When considering the relationship between language policy and national security, the words of Shore et al. (2011) offer an important reminder about the nature of policy:

> Policy - which is presented as good, democratic, authoritative, rational and techno-scientific - is a profoundly political technology which serves the interests of powerful groups and is often detrimental to subaltern groups, who may have no other option but to resist it (p. 225).

Investment in languages beyond English, especially within the confines of the military and intelligence communities can be clearly seen in the 2005 US Department of Defense Language Transformation Roadmap discussed in Chapter 1. The Department of Defense roadmap, published two years before the earliest state language roadmap, outlines the principal sectors of national language capacity as "academic, federal, heritage and industry" and positions these sectors as essential elements in any language roadmap (Brecht & Rivers, 2012, p. 273). In turn, state language roadmaps were able to draw on linguistic instrumentalism in relation to national security. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, I

critically analyze the instrumentalist discourse used in and around the language roadmaps, especially in relation to power and politics.

Conceptualizing Language

Any critique of language policy must be mindful of how language is being theorized. The previous sections presented an overview of language policy and planning, reviewed orientations towards language and offered the concept of assemblage as one way to understand the dynamic connections between language, policy and power. While establishing a theoretical framework for understanding language policy is an important part of moving towards a critical analysis of state language roadmaps, it is not sufficient. A discursive analysis of language ideology in policy also requires a thorough understanding of how language itself functions in society. Theorizing the role of linguistic ideologies in the ecology of language policy requires a critical examination of the concept of language, introduced below through a discussion of named language and an exploration of essential discourse features.

Naming Languages

Although language can be represented through references to phonology, morphology and syntax, at its core, language is a social and political construct (Pennycook, 2002; Orellana & García, 2014). In describing the history of named languages, Kramsch and Huffmaster (2015) write:

> Foreign languages, like nations, were imagined as belonging to clearly defined national communities of native speakers, as limited by clearly defined grammatical borders and as strictly policed by the standard rules of usage found in a nation's grammars and dictionaries (p. 115).

The naming of discrete languages, however, is not aligned with the realities of language use. Named languages are all composed of many different social languages that enact particular identities (Gee, 2004). Larsen-Freeman (2012) writes that one of the ways that society copes with complexity is by reifying constant change and nominalizing dynamic processes. The nominalization process, such as with named languages, implies a sense of stasis when in reality, language development is never static (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). In addition, in many places around the world there are "long chains of interrelated dialects and languages with no clear internal boundaries" (Mühlhäusler, 2012, p. 424). These long chains, or linguistic continua, have been arbitrarily divided into separate and distinct languages. Often, it is a single point along a language continuum that has become standardized, with all other language points becoming deviations from the standard (Mühlhäusler, 2012).

Conceptualizing languages as discrete entities can be seen as a colonial artifact. Named languages are "constructs of nation-state building and colonial expansion to support an ideology of racial, class, and gender superiority in multilingual societies" (García & Kleifgen, 2020, p. 4). The categorical thinking that constructs borders around particular linguistic features and classifies languages as bounded systems reflects an epistemology that is part of the legacy of colonialism (Major, 2018). Languages were invented as part of colonial projects and thus require disinvention (Pennycook, 2002, Motha, 2014). The fiction of linguistic rigidity compels us to problematize artificial boundaries between languages and move towards a theory of language policy and practice that honors hybridity (Motha, 2014).

The idea that named languages are not a cognitive reality is not uncontested, as MacSwan (2017) has argued for an integrated multilingual model that values and necessitates the structural idealizations of named languages (MacSwan, 2017). Larsen-Freeman (2012) also argues that boundaries are arbitrary, but necessary. In the case of marginalized languages like Basque, naming languages can have significant social implications (Leung & Valdés, 2019). With these contested views in mind, this research acknowledges the hegemony of English resulting from linguistic imperialism, while also maintaining that English is not an objective linguistic category, but rather a socially and politically constructed practice fundamentally connected to race and power (Phillipson, 1992). Understandings of language must shift from static and stratified views of language that represent a sense of modern nationalism to more dynamic and fluid approaches that recognize multiple ways of meaning-making (Kramsch & Huffmaster, 2015).

Defining Discourse

Luke (1995) writes that, "Discourse has a hegemonic function. Its principal effect is to establish itself as a form of common sense" (p. 20). As human beings, we cannot operate outside of discourse, so it is important that we learn to recognize the key features of discourse. Whether conscious or unconscious, all language choices serve a purpose (Mullet, 2018). Systems of meaning are not neutral (Rogers, 2004), and languaging is not just saying something but also doing something (Gee, 2004). While the function of language is often associated with the communication of information, scholars such as Gee (2005) argue that the primary function is instead "to support the performance of social activities and social identities and to support human affiliation within cultures,

social groups and institutions" (p. 1). Mullet (2018) writes that, "Power can be enacted implicitly through control of discourse, for example, in syntax or choice of words" (p. 136). Discourse has power (Gal, 1989), and it is simultaneously productive, particular to reality, and dynamic. The challenge of analyzing language is that meaning-making is non-unified (Blommaert et al., 2015). Textual features may index certain contextual meanings, but because of intrinsic environmental polycentricity all language expression contains a range of sociocultural meanings, depending on when and where it is produced (Blommaert et al., 2015).

One way to distinguish between the denotational meanings of language and the broader sociocultural frames in which they exist is through Gee's (2004) differentiation between discourse with a lowercase "d" (e.g. *discourse*) and discourse with a capital "D" (e.g. *Discourse*). Lowercase *discourse* refers to the use of language in all its attendant particularities, whether spoken or written while *Discourse* with a capital "D" refers to a larger mental and material model of what it means to be and do a specific and recognizable identity within the world. According to Gee (2004), *discourse* represents the actual examples of oral and written language in use while *Discourse* represents the practices of groups, including their ways of speaking and being. *Discourse* practices do not have tight boundaries and can shift over time and space (Gee, 2004). Through *Discourse*, groups build social relationships and identities (Rogers, 2004). Language in the form of *Discourse* is constitutive of social practices and social practices are in turn implicated in the distribution of social goods like power and status (Gee, 2004). As a result, Gee (2004) maintains that "All language use is political" (p. 29). In a similar vein,

Fairclough (2003) writes that "*Discourses* may construct and reconstruct social practices, social structures, and social life" (p. 23, *emphasis added*). Discourses can be a representation of the material world, but they can also represent a vision or 'imaginaries' of what could be (Fairclough, 2003, p. 23). Discourse is therefore constructed by the world, but it also plays a role in constructing the world. The recognition work involved in understanding *Discourse* is reflexive in that the language (or *discourse*) used both creates and is created by the *Discourse* in question. Ideologies can be understood as partially constitutive and representative of larger social *Discourses*.

Approaches to Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is one methodology that researchers can use to explore the dialectical and co-constitutive relationship between discourse and social structure (Rogers, 2004). While there is no single theory or framework for discourse analysis, there are similarities in how scholars have attended to this issue. This section explores some of the similarities between approaches to discourse analysis. One common approach to discourse analysis is the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework most commonly associated with Norman Fairclough (1995). The CDA framework, along with other more general approaches to critical discourse analysis, foreground power in their recognition that language is only one part of a meaning making and representational system (Rogers, 2004). Through critical approaches to discourse analysis, social theories can be brought into conversation and dialogue with one another to investigate questions of power and status in society (Rogers, 2004). In writing about Fairclough's work, Rogers (2004) explains that CDA requires critique, but critique is not the end goal. CDA pushes beyond

critique to “forge alternative ways of representing, being, and interacting in the world with the goal of creating a society free from oppression and domination” (Rogers, 2004, p. 5). While this research is not explicitly grounded in the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), my work does seek to incorporate critiques of institutionalized power and privilege through the process of discourse analysis. In order to accomplish the transformational goal of discourse analysis through a critical lens, it is necessary to pair coherent critique with productive possibilities.

One of the foundational elements of any general approach to critical discourse analysis is to recognize that texts do not have meaning by themselves. García and Kleifgen (2020) argue that “Texts are not self-enclosed systems with a priori meanings; their meaning emerges in the interaction of objects, places, and linguistic resources, particularly social spaces” (p. 6). Critical analysis of discourse, therefore, requires an analysis of the entire textual assemblage, including what is said, and what may be left out (Rogers, 2004). Discourse analysis moves beyond individual language choices (e.g. *discourse*) to examine how language is used to build relations and connections between ideas and people (e.g. *Discourse)*. Inherent in this positioning are questions of power and privilege. Gee (2011) writes that “What we do in communication with each other is not always benign.” (p. 8). One of the purposes of discourse analysis, then, is to determine in what ways our language may be doing harm to those around us. Discourse analysis can be used to “discover better, deeper, and more humane interpretations” (Gee, 2005, p. xi). By becoming more intentional about questioning our assumptions and interpretations, we are able to understand more deeply, which in turn helps us to engage more humanely in

the world. This study uses some of the general theoretical framing for discourse analysis offered by Gee (2005) in his *Introduction to Discourse Analysis.* While methodological tools are covered more deeply in Chapter 3, the following section highlights some of the key concepts of Gee's (2005) framework.

Purpose of Language

The meanings that we build through language allow us to communicate, but they also allow us to do things in the world. Gee (2005, 2011) argues that this 'doing' can include both building and destroying, and he organizes language in use within seven broad purposes: significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign systems and knowledge. This section summarizes each of these purposes with an example aligned to language policy and planning. The task of *significance* looks at how language is used to give meaning or value to things. By speaking or writing in a particular way, language can make certain things significant. In this study, I look at how language is used to give value to bilingualism. The *activities* task refers to how language is used to enact a particular activity. The ways that an individual talks and acts can be recognized as engagement in language education or language activism. Language can also be used for identity enactment and recognition. The *identities* task could ask how language learners are recognized and how language could be used to enact an identity that is 'bilingual' with the understanding that identity is both situational and socially constructed (Abdi, 2011). The *relationships* task looks at how language is used to signal or build a particular relationship. The language used between a school and a community could provide evidence of what type of relationship exists or could exist between them.

The *politics* task refers to how language is used to communicate a particular perspective on the distribution of social goods. By defining what is 'appropriate', 'normal' or 'good', language can (re)distribute social goods like power, status and responsibility. Policies that establish language education programs are inherently political because they define who has access to a particular set of social goods related to language. Language can also be used to make connections visible or not (Gee, 2011). The *connections* task looks at how language is used to connect or disconnect certain things. An example of this could be seen in how language is used to connect certain types of bilingualism with future career opportunities. The *sign systems and knowledge* task asks us to consider how language can be used to privilege or deprivilege certain forms of knowledge and varieties of languages. When a language like English is given prestige and status, we see this building task at work. Although these seven building tasks (*significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections,* and *sign systems and knowledge*) will not be apparent in all data, Gee (2005) suggests that studying these tasks in action can help to understand the social and political consequences of language.

Gee (2005) also uses the term "Conversations" with a capital "C" to refer to the "myriad of interactional events taking place among specific people at specific times and places" (p. 49). A Conversation would therefore include all of the various perspectives on a particular issue that are open to reference through on-going interaction and interpretation. In Chapter 4, I introduce a Conversation on the benefits of multilingualism by looking at the various themes that converge across the texts of the language roadmaps and supporting documents. Conversations trigger people to think about particular things

and to interpret new information in light of the on-going debate (Gee, 2005). Discussing the benefits of multilingualism, therefore, entails triggering certain interpretations about what it means to be multilingual and who benefits from multilingualism.

Understanding how various *Discourses* and *Conversations* operate within our world is crucial to understanding the world itself. Gee (2005) writes that the "fundamental job of education [is] to give people bigger and better Discourse maps" (p. 32). By this, he means that all *Discourses* can be placed in relation to each other on an ever-changing map that allows us to negotiate our understanding of particular *Discourses* in action. A *Discourse* map has flexible boundaries that help guide recognition while also shifting in response to each enactment in the world. One essential component of *Discourse* models is that they include assumptions about what is 'normal' or 'appropriate' (Gee, 2005). Normalizing certain ways of thinking and being is implicated in the distribution of social goods like power and status and is therefore inherently political. Luke (1995) writes that "One of the main purposes of critical language studies is to denaturalize everyday language" (p. 12). The role of a critical approach to discourse analysis, therefore is to demonstrate how *Discourse* manifests through the *discourse* of everyday texts. The following section examines one particular *Discourse*, neoliberalism, that connects explicitly to the text of state language roadmaps.

Relating Language and Social Theory

Having established the theoretical framework for understanding language policy, theories of language, and discourse analysis, the next section of this review turns towards one specific social theory that can be surfaced through a critical analysis of current

language policy: neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is an example of Gee's (2004) *Discourse*, a way of thinking and being that shapes access to power and status. Language ideologies are impacted not only by the social and political legacies of colonialism, but also through the ongoing economic inheritance of neoliberalism. Harvey (2007) defines neoliberalism as a:

> theory of political economic practices proposing that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, unencumbered markets, and free trade (p. 22).

Neoliberalism, however, cannot be treated as something static and monolithic (Shore et al., 2011). Understanding neoliberalism, therefore, requires attention to an assemblage of factors, many of which are demonstrated by covert language changes (Fairclough, 2003). In general, neoliberalism is marked by shifts in the ways that governments intervene in markets (Hyatt, 2011) as well as the "corporatization, commodification, and privatization of hitherto public assets" (Harvey, 2007 p. 35). Concepts of free market and competition are fundamental, as are issues of consumerism and choice.

Within education spaces, neoliberalism is evidenced by the massive corporate testing and textbook industries, accountability systems, the marketing and privatization of schools, and voucher programs that propose to offer school choice through school charters (Flores & Chaparro, 2018). Neoliberalism places institutions, groups and individuals in competition with one another. Competition can also be seen in the commodification of language, including privileged languages like English, as well as through marginalized languages used in bilingual education programs.

Harvey (2007) writes that neoliberalism has become part of the "commonsense way we interpret, live in, and understand the world" (p. 22). The prerequisites to this naturalization, as described by Harvey (2007), includes the construction of a "conceptual apparatus", one which "appeals almost naturally to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the possibilities that seem to inhere in the social world we inhabit" (p. 24). The commonsense, conceptual apparatus of neoliberalism can be applied to understandings of language privilege, which ultimately impacts the ways in which we talk about the benefits of multilingualism, and how those benefits come to be distributed across society through language education policies and practices.

Neoliberalism and Language Commodification

Within an ecological framework, neoliberalism has played a significant role in shaping current attitudes and beliefs about multilingualism through the commodification of language. Discourses of language commodification "have grown increasingly prominent worldwide under the politico-economic conditions of globalized late capitalism" (Brennan, 2018). Language commodification redefines languages as quantifiable and measurable skills, the valuation and distribution of which are connected to social, economic and political conditions (Heller, 2003). Languages are often framed hegemonically as human capital (Valdez et al., 2016; Subtirelu, 2017). Sharma & Phyak (2017) write that "The deregulated neoliberal market, as part of the capitalist economy, understand human beings, their linguistic skills, and abilities as commodities" (p. 231). In discussing the relationship between multilingualism and language commodification, Subtirelu (2017) writes that:

> [T]he discourse of multilingualism as human capital considerably underestimates the complexities and contradictions that go into treating language as commodity and assigning it value. In particular, it does not consider how the processes of determining whether individuals possess linguistic skills and assignment those skills value rely on ideologies of language and take place within existing systems of unequal power (p. 478).

In the neoliberal economy, information is a resource, and it can also be a commodity to be controlled (Glazier & Hall, 1996; Ndimande, 2018). Through globalization, language has also taken up a role as a resource which has also led to language being treated as a commodity. English in particular has become a commodity that indexes cosmopolitan membership (Lam & Warriner, 2012) and neoliberal language discourse continues to position English as essential for professional success (Motha, 2014). Neoliberal commodification of English as a language of privilege and status reproduces the effects of English imperialism and coloniality (Vandrick, 2014). The global market for teaching English in particular is a strong example of neoliberalism because of the way in which it has led to the profit of transnational corporations and the reinforcement of traditional power dynamics (Flores, 2013). The commodification of language, especially English, needs to be acknowledged precisely for the ways in which it contributes to perpetuation of hierarchical language ideologies (Douglas Fir Group, 2016). Scholars such as Flores (2013) have addressed neoliberalism and language commodification by questioning how the global field of teaching English might be complicit in promoting the neoliberal agenda and silencing subaltern voices.

Neoliberalism and Bilingualism

The value of linguistic capital is only attained relative to language ideologies in the field (Lam & Warriner, 2012). As Darvin and Norton (2014) write, "Discourses only gain value when others grant them, based on their market value" (p. 59). In the case of bilingualism, neoliberalism has co-opted discourses of bilingualism as a market benefit (Poza, 2017). Through neoliberalism, even bilingual education programs once focused on antidiscrimination have seen shifts towards commodification of language (Flores & García, 2017). The focus of dual language education programs has shifted away from empowering minoritized student populations and towards commodifying bilingualism, a strategy that can be clearly seen through the marketing of dual language programs to gentrifying communities (Flores & Chaparro, 2018). The growing trend towards promoting multilingualism and immersion programming for economic benefits is a strong example of interest convergence (Kelly, 2017). The market benefit of bilingualism, however, is not applied equally to all individuals. Ethnic groups that have been racialized and marginalized are further subordinated through neoliberal and neocolonial discourse (Darvin & Norton, 2014). Individual language practices are understood, identified and assigned value through raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores and Rosa, 2015).

The increasing interest in multilingualism has less to do with imperatives of social justice and more to do with neoliberal distribution of capital (Luke, 1995). The tensions raised by promoting multilingualism for economic purposes was highlighted by Kelly (2017) in her discursive analysis of several state-level bilingual education policies. She writes, "Some feel that the push for bilingual education for economic purposes

marginalizes the concerns, needs, and funding of ELs [English Learners], and others see it as the only viable way forward for bilingual education in hostile policy climates" (Kelly, 2017, p. 17). The discursive shift toward a human capital orientation corresponds to a shift away from bilingual programs designed to promote equity for heritage speakers and toward language programming designed for the economic benefits of those with power and privilege (Valdez et al., 2016) which raises a significant concern that focusing on the economic benefits of bilingualism "may result in narrowing the curriculum" (Kelly, 2017, p. 18).

Evolution of Neoliberalism

Sharma and Phyak (2017) write that "It is necessary to engage language users and other stakeholders in an explicit analysis of ideologies shaping their own language practices in the climate of neoliberal hegemony" (p. 253). Some scholars, like Hyatt (2011), have argued that the role of neoliberalism in shaping society is slowly giving way to the social theory of authoritarianism, in which policing and control has assumed primacy as a mechanism for governance. Since 9/11, Hyatt (2011) argues, the values and key words of neoliberalism, such as free markets, competition, privatization, have begun to give way to values of surveillance and control including safety, security and protection. Hyatt (2011) writes that:

> The overarching focus of current social policies has shifted from the enactment of state-level measures intended to promote the operation of 'free markets' to appropriating a range of local-level and, in many cases, community-based and voluntary sector mechanisms with the aim of safeguarding our safety and security (p. 120).

The transformation from neoliberalism to authoritarianism, however, is in no way complete (Hyatt, 2011). Any analysis of policy seeking to disrupt current power dynamics must pay close attention to the ways in which social forces like neoliberalism, and perhaps authoritarianism, continue to shape views on language. The following sections thread together the themes explored above to expound on the relationship between language ideology and language policy and planning.

Co-Construction of Language Ideologies and Language Policy

An ecological orientation to LPP examines multiple dimensions of language, including the relationships between language policies with individual experiences and beliefs (Hult, 2010). At their core, language policies are influenced and guided by language ideologies (Eggington, 2010; Davis, 2014; Douglas Fir Group, 2016), and they find their viability in institutions and practices (Ramanathan, 2005). Language policy and planning recognizes that educational language policies are created and interpreted across multiple levels, from the micro level of individual interaction to the meso and macro levels of state and national policy (Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Douglas Fir Group, 2016). Policies on language can influence "which language or languages are official, which languages and language varieties are valued, how they are to be used in community settings, and the educational opportunities that are made available to individuals to learn, use, and maintain them" (Douglas Fir Group, 2016, p. 33). Within an ecological framing, language policies cannot be assumed to have linear cause and effect outcomes because relationships between language and society are highly complex (Tollefson, 2010).

While initially assumed to lead to improvements in social conditions, language policy and planning has in many cases led to increasing marginalization for subaltern populations (Tollefson, 2010). As discussed at the start of this chapter, early language planning efforts were informed by the idealization of a standard national language (Ricento, 2000). As Poza (2017) writes:

> extensive centralized planning placed one language variety atop all others as the exclusive variety for use in official channels and then diffused this variety by way of media, schooling, and coercion through allocation of educational and occupational opportunities to users of prestige varieties over others (p. 106).

Policy offers a way to organize, classify and privilege specific social relations (Shore et al., 2011). Language policies in particular have played a significant role in the construction of the other (Pennycook, 2002), and have ultimately served to minoritize and stratify people (Ramanathan, 2005). Within education specifically, language policy is implicated in the construction and positioning of racialized students (Viesca et al., 2019). Multilingual learners have been constructed as a homogeneous group, masking the diversity of strengths and needs they bring with them into classroom spaces. In addition, the positioning and labeling of students as not proficient in English frames a deficit-based narrative for students and their families. In addition to significant impacts in the education domain, language policy also intersects with language ideology to play an important role in both government and business, through the identification and patronage of languages deemed critical to national security and commerce.

Institutional Reproduction and Change

The decentralization of social discourse around neoliberalism can sometimes make it difficult to identify the specific policy actors (Shore et al., 2011). It is precisely because of this challenge that research on language policy must attend to the reproduction of language ideologies at both individual and institutional levels. Gee (2005) writes that "Studying the way in which situations produce and reproduce institutions, and are, in turn, sustained by them, is an important part of discourse analysis" (p. 102). Institutions can frequently "act as gatekeepers to discursive resources" (Mullet, 2018, p. 117) and they can be fairly resistant to discursive change (Fairclough, 2003). As social institutions, schools are responsible for the reproduction of language ideologies that reinforce the political domination of certain languages (Fuller, 2009). Schools create the scaffolds and schemata that organize the unwritten rules and produce the normative positioning of particular ideologies (Wang, 2016). Within institutions like schools, there is no need for authoritative intervention to produce ideological constraints (Clemens & Cook, 1999).

Institutions are social constructs (Wang, 2016) with implicit and explicit rules that constrain the choices made by the actors within (Ingram & Clay, 2000). As such, the beliefs within any given institution are able to perpetuate themselves with limited external intervention. The normative construction of language within schools informs individual epistemologies, which in turn inform individual choices (Ahmed, 2010). Through this process, the monoglossic ideologies of language found within schools inform deficit discourses of multilingual learners which in turn impact the design and implementation of policy across multiple levels and scales. The relationship between

social discourse and individual choice is supported by research which demonstrates that institutional change is indeed framed by individual beliefs (Ingram & Clay, 2000). While state actions and policies play a role in sanctioning and legitimizing certain variations of language, the individual choices made within school systems also perpetuate the legitimization of certain forms of the English language (MacSwan, 2017). As Luke (1995) writes, "Discourse in institutional life can be viewed as a means for the naturalization and disguise of power relations that are tied to inequalities in the social production and distribution of symbolic and material resources" (p. 12).

Gee (2011) argues that "activities, identities, and institutions have to be continuously and actively rebuilt in the here and now" (p. 85). As specific institutions become more entrenched through continued reproduction, they become more difficult to dismantle (Beckert, 2010). High levels of reproducibility within schools may lead to higher levels of reliability and accountability, but they also create inertia from both internal and external pressures that makes educational systems resistant to change (Hannan & Freeman, 1984). This resistance is true even in the case of inefficient institutions which are able to persist because of power relations between actors (Ingram & Clay, 2000). The disparate educational outcomes for multilingual learners in the United States represents a systemic failure that continues to perpetuate itself because of internal and external pressures. By drawing attention to the ways in which particular ideologies are reproduced through state language policy documents, this study lends greater understanding to the reproduction of inefficient and inequitable language policies and practices within schools, businesses and government agencies.

Engagement and Contestation in Language Policy and Planning

A discussion of language policy and planning would be incomplete without consideration for how policies are enacted and contested throughout various levels of an ecological framework. The promotion of agency and policy enactment at the intersection of macro, meso and micro levels is an example of engaged language policy and practice (Davis, 2014). Scholars like Davis (2014) have suggested a shift away from labeling the field as language policy and planning to the more inclusive language policy and practices. This shift recognizes the complexities within the enactment of language policy. As Davis (2014) writes, "Engaged language policy and practices is also about breaking down the strait-jacket-like constraints of research paradigmatic expectations through blurring the boundaries of science, art, interpretation, identity, language, activism and advocacy" (p. 92). Engaged language policy and practice recognizes how language choices and performances can extend or contest existing language policy (Lo Bianco, 2010). Policies have agency. They are able to shift action and interact with other agents in dynamic processes (Shore et al., 2011). Policy contestation can happen from many different directions (Wright & Reinhold, 2011). The agency of policies and the actors who engage with them mean that policies are continually being translated and transformed into new spaces. Wright & Reinhold (2011) write that policy is in fact a "continuous process of contestation across a political space" (p. 86) and it is within this space of contestation that I seek to situate my study of state language roadmaps.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of literature that supports analysis and theorization of state level language roadmaps. The first part of this literature review introduced key understandings within the field of language policy and planning, including the domains of LPP and orientations towards language. These orientations were connected to the construct of language ideologies, drawing attention to the marginalization that occurs through monoglossic language ideologies and the hegemony of English. Dynamic conceptualizations of policy assemblages were introduced to contrast traditional and static views of language and language practices, which opened space to explore the intersections of power and ideology, including the role of language policy and national security. To counter traditional and colonialistic views of language, the idea of named languages was called into question alongside critical approaches to discourse analysis. In exploring the terrain of discourse analysis, this review focused specifically on how particular discourse models help to "reproduce, transform, or create social, cultural, institutional and/or political relationships" (Gee, 2005, p. 93). The sympoiesis between discourse and society was used as a rationale for exploring social theory of neoliberalism. The impact of neoliberalism on language status and policy was discussed in relation to the commodification of English and bilingual programming. Finally, connections between language ideologies and language policies were addressed with specific attention to institutional reproduction and individual contestation. Together, these concepts lay the foundation for an in-depth exploration of how state-level language

roadmaps were developed and how they (re)produce particular ideologies about language within the communities they serve.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

The purpose of this study is to investigate the development and discourse of state language roadmaps with the goal of understanding how these state policy texts (re)produce particular language ideologies. This research is beneficial for language policy actors and arbiters who may be interested in recasting language education policies and practices in more inclusive and equitable ways. This chapter begins by overviewing the research questions and continues with a description of the study design, including my approach to research methodology, data collection and data analysis. Within this chapter, I also highlight aspects of validity and trustworthiness in qualitative research, as well as discussing some of the specific limitations for this study.

Research Questions

While there are many aspects to state language roadmaps that could potentially lead to meaningful discussion, the scope and timeline of this research required that I narrow the focus to a few critical areas of inquiry. In prioritizing research questions for my study, I chose to focus on questions that could help to illuminate discourse that naturalizes systems of power and privilege. In my role as a practitioner-scholar, I believe the purpose of research is to affect change, whether discursively through changing thinking about a topic, or materially through supporting changes to public policy. In support of a catalyzing and critical ideological analysis of these state-level language roadmaps, the research questions addressed in this study include:

A. What language ideologies exist in the text of language roadmaps?
B. What discourses exist surrounding the language roadmaps and their development?

C. How are these discourses and language ideologies evident in policy proposals?

Study Design

This study is a qualitative policy discourse analysis with a focus on a synchronic overview of language roadmap development. As a researcher, my epistemological orientation includes threads of interpretivism, constructivism and critical theory. I reject positivist paradigms that suppose an objective, observable reality. Instead, I believe that there are multiple forms of knowledge that are co-constructed and interpreted through different perspectives and that the role of research is to work towards social justice. The design of this study draws on notions of policy archaeology (Scheurich, 1994) and anthropology of policy (Shore et al., 2011) as ways to map the topography of a field and examine the interactions between macro-level forces and micro-level events and discourse. Anthropology of policy offers new ways to look at policy fields by asking what policy means to different audiences (Shore et al., 2011). The definition of policy necessarily shapes data collection and methodology. Studying how definitions and contestations of policy flow through different sites requires attention to how semantics are transformed over time and space (Wright & Reinhold, 2011).

While this paper examines the convergence of policies produced in different states, it is also interested in how these policies, whether similar or not, take on different meanings in different contexts. Hult (2010) writes that "Language policies are part and parcel of the discursive social contexts of the societies for which they are crafted" (p. 9). This paper uses Wright and Reinhold's (2011) approach to 'studying through' by tracing how the meanings and processes are transformed in their movement through different

sites. ‘Studying through’ does not presume a linear or hierarchical organization to the policy process. Instead, it recognizes that contestations of discourse may weave up and down and back and forth through local and national sites involving actors in many different positions (Wright & Reinhold, 2011). Specific discourse analysis tools and strategies, described in the sections below, will be used to trace these meanings situated across particular times and spaces.

Before describing the data sources and methods used in this study, it is important to note that qualitative inquiry is both emergent and flexible. This study set out to examine the presence of specific language ideologies within state language roadmaps and to explore how particular beliefs around the benefits of bilingualism may have informed specific content within the roadmaps. In keeping with the emergent nature of qualitative research, the study focus evolved through conversations with interview participants and through additional investigation and analysis of the roadmap development process. My research questions shifted to become more inclusive with an emphasis more on evidentiary findings and less on causality. The evolution of my research questions throughout this study represents responsiveness to an analytical process that is situated in complex and dynamic human beliefs and practices. The final research questions and methodology presented in this chapter represent an iterative process that evolved over time as I engaged with multiple forms of text and advanced my own understanding.

Selection and Approach to Data

Studying through requires separating the concepts of site and field (Wright & Reinhold, 2011). Involving multiple sites with a broad and dynamic view of the field

offers researchers an opportunity to trace the transformation of policy and language in all directions. It is important to note that "every experience, encounter, conversation, document or public event" can be interpreted as significant cultural texts (Shore et al., 2011, p. 15). The selection of language roadmaps for this study was based on publicly available language policy documents designed for broad applicability across an entire state population. I sought documents that explicitly promoted multilingualism and narrowed my selection to the state language roadmaps funded through the Language Flagship and the National Security Education Program (NSEP). As of 2020, there were eight state roadmaps that were publicly available on the Language Flagship website, including Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Rhode Island, Hawai'i, Wisconsin and Indiana. This selection excludes the language roadmap initiative from California because, although it was funded in part through NSEP, it was not posted on the Language Flagship website. Based on participant interviews, the California language roadmap initiative did not result in a published roadmap that would have comparable scale and scope to the other states.

In addition to the collection of policy texts and artifacts, interviewing was also used to collect data for the study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) describe interviews as conversations with a purpose. Interview questions can be used to collect data about participant experiences, behaviors, opinions, values, feelings, or knowledge (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2017). Using the acknowledgements sections of the language roadmap documents, I identified key actors in each of the state roadmap processes who might be able to speak to the origin and development of the roadmap process. Through these initial

contacts, I expanded the pool of prospective interview participants through referral sampling. Table 1 summarizes the site of interview participants during the time at which the roadmaps were written.

Table 1

Interview Participants by Site

	OH	OR	TX	UT	HI	RI	WI	IN	Multiple
Number	3	2	1	2	3	3	4	4	2

While some participants were involved with multiple state initiatives to varying degrees, the majority have been categorized by the site of their principal involvement. For participants indicating significant involvement across multiple sites, the label 'Multiple' is used below. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, participants are identified by their primary site of involvement. Table 2 summarizes interview participants by role at the time during which their respective state language roadmap was drafted.

Table 2

Interview Participants by Role

	Graduate Students	University Professors	State Education Agency Staff	Community Consultants
Number	7	11	3	3

In order to protect participant identities, the roles have been generalized into broad categories, and therefore may not reflect actual participant titles. The category of 'Graduate Student' includes individuals who may have also held other concurrent

employment in other roles, including program coordination, the category of 'University Professor' includes additional university staff such as Deans or Directors of Flagship programs, and the category of 'Community Consultant' includes both community advisors and federally-funded NSEP staff.

While all of the participants had overlapping interests related to multilingualism and language education, their positionality and approach to the language roadmap initiatives varied significantly. Some participants spoke highly of both the initiatives as a whole and the Language Flagship as the initiative sponsors while other participants were more reticent or critical of certain aspects of the initiative, including perceived contingencies related to funding objectives. Most participants expressed individual appreciate for their involvement with their respective state level initiative, but also raised questions related to implementation and sustainability. While I recognize that more detailed descriptions of each of the interview participants would help to situate their responses, I have opted for more generalized labels throughout the text to protect participant identities.

A total of 23 interviews were conducted involving 24 total interview participants. Two participants opted to be interviewed concurrently because of their shared experiences with a particular state roadmap initiative. I chose to use a semi-structured interview process (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) to allow for a certain degree of correspondence across the interviews while also creating space to explore emergent themes and ideas (*See Appendix E: Interview Guide*). The interviews ranged in length from 30 minutes to an hour and a half and were primarily conducted through the

videoconferencing platforms Zoom and Microsoft Teams with one phone interview. After the interviews were completed and transcribed, I conducted a preliminary data analysis and shared a mid-course research review with each of the participants for member checking. These follow-up emails allowed me to clarify the general themes and patterns from the interviews and gather additional affirmations and rebuttals of my ongoing analysis and interpretation.

Interviews as Co-Constructed Dialogue

The decision to use interviews as part of this research study raises a significant tension regarding the ideology of research interviews. Talmy (2011) problematizes ideologies that frame interviews solely as instruments of research and offers an alternative perspective of interviews as social practices and interactional events. In describing the uncritical adoption of interviews as research instruments, Talmy (2010) writes that interviews have often been theorized as a "resource for investigating truths, facts, experience, beliefs, attitudes, and/or feelings of respondents" (p. 131). This theorization, however, disregards the role of the researcher in co-constructing interview data and fails to acknowledge the asymmetric power that researchers have in entextualizing and recontextualizing elements of discourse (Talmy, 2010). Gee (2005) writes that "Socially situated identities are mutually co-constructed in interviews, just as much as they are in everyday conversations" (p. 139). The discursive choices made by interview participants are reflexively related to the ways in which social identities are indexed through interactional moves (DeFina & Perrino, 2011).

In addition to generating research data and answering research questions, viewing interviews as social practice challenges notions of neutrality and opens opportunities for reflection on the process of interviewing itself (Talmy, 2010). The interview data from this study will be analyzed not only with attention to the content of the interviews themselves, but also with regard for highlighting the process of the interviews and the role of the interviewer in the co-construction of discourse. DeFina & Perrino (2011) quote Mischler (1989) as asking "How can the presence and influence of an interviewer be taken into account in the analysis and interpretation of a respondent's story?" (p. 96). This question assumes that there is something that could be done to mitigate the impact of researcher interaction by adjusting interpretation and analysis. Instead of viewing the role of the interviewer as a corrupting influence, Wortham et al. (2011) argue for value in the interactional aspects of interviews. As a researcher, I recognize that my presence and interactional moves within each of the interviews were co-constitutive in the discourse that was produced. The questions I asked, my physical positioning, responses and pauses in dialogue all contributed to the construction of discourse, and my interpretation reflects this understanding, not as a problem to be ameliorated, but as a function and affordance of the dialogic interview process.

Boundaries of Data Collection

The policy texts themselves, accompanying artifacts produced and published in relation to the language roadmap initiatives, and the transcripts of each of the interviews were used as a starting point for the study sample. In defining the study sample, it is important to note that the map of a policy field is not static and can expand and contract

throughout the course of study (Shore et al., 2011). As such, the field and the sites cannot always be delimited entirely in advance (Wright & Reinhold, 2011). As Yanow writes, "A policy issue's borders are more diffuse than those of a village or city: no civil administrator or planner has drawn a red line around it on a map" (p. 306). As policies move between sites, they are re-translated, and this retranslation opens up space for contestation (Shore et al., 2011). Over the course of the research process, the number of related artifacts that I included in my study increased as interview participants recommended and shared additional documents that were relevant to language roadmap work. All of the texts gathered for this study, including the language roadmaps, accompanying artifacts and interview transcriptions were studied through discourse analysis. The following sections describe my approach to data analysis and the specific frameworks and tools used in the analysis process.

Approach to Data Analysis

Policy documents, like the state language roadmaps in this study, are a fitting scene for discourse analysis because they are responsible for supplying discourse to a broad audience. While there are many different theories and tools that could be used for discourse analysis, I have chosen to base my work on those presented by Gee (2005, 2011). In his *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, he argues that there is no "universally right or universally applicable" theory of discourse analysis (2011, p. ix). Instead, he recommends that analysts take and adapt the tools from a given theory to meet the needs of their study. Gee (2005) also maintains that discourse analysis is designed to serve a purpose. I am not analyzing language-in-use for the sake of analysis itself, but rather to

contribute evidence and understanding to topics that I care about. For me, this care is centered on how to approach language use in schools in more humane ways. As discussed earlier, the epistemology represented in this paper draws in part from the basic tenets of critical theory, which seeks to investigate "the processes by which social inequality is produced and sustained, and the struggle to reduce inequality to bring about greater forms of social justice" (Tollefson, 2006, p. 43-44). The discourse analysis enacted throughout this paper is critical in that it seeks to uncover, understand, and upend social inequalities masked by naturalized ideologies.

The discourse analysis framework and tools described below have been selected based on their relevance to the research and researcher. As a student and novice researcher, I have adapted the general analytical framework proposed by Mullet (2008) for its simplicity and coherence. Although the framework is organized in stages, I also recognize that qualitative research on discourse is nonlinear, and analysis may move intermittently between stages. Table 3 overviews the stages of discourse analysis, beginning with the selection of the discourse.

Table 3

Framework for Data Analysis

Stage	Description
Discourse Selection	The selected discourse for this study is language ideology in state policy.

Location and Preparation of Data Sources	State-level language policy roadmaps were located on the NSEP website. Interview participants were located through the text of the roadmaps and participant referrals. Additional artifacts were located through state roadmap initiative websites and through interview referrals. Audio recordings of each interview were transcribed through Otter software with hand revisions.
Text Background	The origin, development and authorship of the texts was explored in relation to social and historical contextualization.
Coding the Data	An iterative process of open coding was used to generate themes and categories across the selected texts.
Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2004)	Discourse analysis tools were used to compare the roadmap texts and the co-constructed interview transcripts with social discourse related to language ideology, including attention to specific linguistic devices (such as word choice, voice, actors and arguments) in the structure of the texts themselves.
Data Interpretation	Patterns and themes from iterative rounds of coding and analytic memoing were used to ground interpretations and implications for policy and practice.

Note: Adapted from Mullet, D. R. (2018). A General Critical Discourse Analysis Framework for Educational Research. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 29*(2), 116–142.

The selected discourse for this study is language ideology in state policy. The next step is locating and preparing data sources. As described above, the texts selected to analyze discourse on language ideology include the state language policy roadmaps located on the Language Flagship website, artifacts from the language roadmap initiative process located on related state websites and through referrals from interview participants, and interviews with key state actors who participated in various elements of the language roadmap initiatives. The participants were invited based on their positionality as key actors in the acknowledgement sections of each roadmap and through

ongoing referrals from other participants. The process used to prepare the interview data for analysis, including the recording and transcription of each interview is described in more detail in the section on transcription below.

After the selection of discourse and the location and preparation of data sources, the third stage in the discourse analysis framework used in this study involved exploring the background of each text by considering their production in context. The notion of context, discussed later in this chapter, included a consideration of the geopolitical, social and historical settings in which the roadmaps were drafted. This contextualization was followed by the fourth stage of coding the texts to identify major themes. Coding the text was an iterative process that involved both inductive and deductive coding. I began by coding inductively for some of the language orientations proposed by Ruiz (1984) and McGroarty (2012), including language as problem, resource, right, refuge and resistance. After inductive coding, I reread the texts and began coding deductively by identifying examples and patterns that could be used to generate additional conceptual theories.

The process of coding was iterative and involved going back and forth within and between texts. The coding was initially completed manually on paper and then transferred fully to a digital repository. The fifth step of the critical discourse analysis framework involves analyzing relations in the texts, first with a consideration of external relations and then through a consideration of internal relations in the text. The analysis of external relations is aligned with the concepts of interdiscursivity and *Discourse* proposed by Gee (2004). The analysis of internal relations was more closely aligned to the conceptualization of *discourse* (Gee, 2004) and included consideration of general and

specific linguistic devices. The specific tools used for discourse analysis are discussed in more detail in the subsequent section.

The final stage in the process was to interpret the data through the themes and relationships identified in the previous stages (Mullet, 2018). The final stages of the data analysis framework presented here recognize that text is productive and not passive. The state language roadmaps reviewed in this study are records, but they are also constructive policy documents that play a role in shaping the world in which we live. The findings from the final interpretation stage are presented in conjunction with the discursive analysis throughout Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

Interview Transcription

The interviews conducted for this study took place over four months between September 2020 and January 2021 with follow-up discussion through email for several months after the final interview. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, and the geographic distribution of interview participants, all interviews were conducted either via the video conferencing platforms Zoom and Microsoft Teams or via phone. Interview participants received a research prospectus in the initial email invitation as well as a copy of an informed consent form (*See Appendix D*) and a copy of the interview questions (*See Appendix E*) in advance of the interview. All of the participants granted consent for the interviews to be audio recorded. Audio recordings were captured through voice memos and Otter software. Some of the interview participants requested that sections of the interview be considered 'off the record' before, during and after the interviews were conducted. None of those 'off the record' conversations were used in my analysis.

Davidson (2009) refers to transcription as a form of selective translation and emphasizes the "need for researchers to be explicit about transcription" (p. 46). In the spirit of transparency, this paragraph outlines my choices regarding the transcription process. Ochs (1979) encourages selectivity in transcription based on both practical and theoretical considerations. In my own transcription process, I decided to focus on a broad, rather than a narrow transcription because of the nature of my research questions. While some linguists and discourse analysts use more narrow transcriptions that reflect greater attention to phonemes and intonational variations, the scale of my data and the focus of my research questions satisficed broad transcriptions.

I transcribed the interview dialogue based on audio files using a standard orthography. I used the transcription software Otter for an initial transcription and followed up with revisions to each transcript by hand. The process of transcription involved going back and forth repeatedly between each transcript and the audio file. While I did include pauses and hesitations as part of the transcript, the use of audio files precluded the inclusion of nonverbals like gestures, eye gaze and body positioning. I fully recognize that nonverbals do not merely co-occur with language but rather co-constitute the message being conveyed (Ochs, 1979). Given that all of the interviews took place over various virtual video conferencing platforms, which have their own limits in being able to fully identify aspects of body orientation and gesturing, I selectively focused on verbal transcription for pragmatic reasons. All of these choices about transcription were made with an understanding that transcription is a process that is "theoretical, selective, interpretive, and representational" (Davidson, 2009, p. 37).

Specific Tools for Discourse Analysis

In his toolkit *How to do Discourse Analysis*, Gee (2011) offers 27 inquiry tools that can be used to analyze text. Each tool requires analysts to look closely at how language is used for being and doing certain things in the world. The tools ask specific questions about language, and it is in the answer to those questions that theories and patterns emerge. For the purposes of this research, I do not address all 27 tools that Gee (2005) introduces, but instead focus on the inquiry tools that are aligned with the seven building tasks described in Chapter 2: *significance, activities, identities, relationships, politics, connections,* and *sign systems and knowledge*. These tools look for examples of how specific beliefs, ideologies and ways of knowing are privileged and de-privileged within the world. With regard to the language roadmaps, these tools highlights how particular languages or language education programs might be organized and empowered through specific policy recommendations.

Intertextuality

In addition to these inquiry tools, I also use the intertextuality tool to examine references or allusions to other texts, where 'text' is understood in its broadest sense, including not only spoken and written text, but all forms of media and shared cultural knowledge. Intertextuality refers to how language is used to relate to and cross-reference other expressive modalities. Luke (1995) defines intertextuality as "repeated and reiterated wordings, statements, and themes that appear in different texts" (p. 13). The intertextuality tool, therefore, refers to the ways in which words and grammar are used to reference other texts, including the repetition of certain words or phrases in language

policy documents (Björkman, 2014). Understanding text requires understanding the connections between texts. Johnson (2015) describes intertextuality by positioning texts in dialogue with one another. The semiotic potential of text is not static and evolves in relation to the reader and the context in which it is read. The dialogic meanings of text, however, are not "infinitely innovative" but instead limited by power relations (Johnson, 2015, p. 168). Approaching discourse analysis through intertextuality was especially helpful in comparing examples of convergence between the language roadmaps and the broader social discourses that surround them.

Figured Worlds and Big "D" Discourse

This study also makes use of the figured worlds tool and the *Discourse* tool (Gee, 2011). Figured worlds, according to Gee (2011), are beliefs and perceptions about how the world works. The figured worlds tool questions what beliefs about the world are being assumed through the text and what figured worlds the text might be inviting the listener into. Finally, the *Discourse* tool seeks to recognize how language is used to enact particular identities. These tools encourage discourse analysts to reflect deeply on assumptions of 'common-sense' by looking at the ways texts can coalesce to naturalize certain discourse within our world. According to Luke (1995), "The task of a critical sociological discourse analysis would be to see how broader formations of discourse and power are manifest in the everyday, quotidian aspects of texts in use" (p. 11).

Situating Text in Context

The notion of context is a critical component of discourse analysis because language in use is designed to assume shared understandings based on shared context. In

order to understand a particular text, therefore, it is important to understand the ways in which it is embedded in social relations and context. Texts are not ahistorical, and their meanings are fluid, which suggests that texts can be read differently across different times and different places. Gee (2011) defines context as the:

> physical setting in which the communication takes place and everything in it; the bodies, eye gaze, gestures, and movements of those present; what has previously been said and done by those involved in the communication; any shared knowledge those involved have, including shared cultural knowledge (p. 6).

While often understood as the physical setting or environment, scholars agree that context is much more than that. Bartlett and Vavrus (2017) write that, "Context is not a primordial or autonomous place; it is constituted by social interactions, political processes, and economic developments across scales and across time" (p. 14). Context can include the physical, but it also includes the historical, political, economic and temporal. For discourse analysts, this means that the meaning of any particular word or phrase is necessarily situated within a specific practice and utterance. Even words that are not considered multiple-meaning words can take on different meanings depending on the circumstances in which they are used. Gee (2005) writes that "Situated meanings are not static and they are not definitions" (p. 67).

A discursive view on context is much more dynamic than what I have covered here so far. Viewing context as a static environment that can provide meaning to language does not account for the reflexive ways in which language shapes context. According to Gee (2011), language functions in part to create particular activities, identities and institutions. Within this perspective, my own identity as a practitioner-

scholar does not exist apart from the language I use to (re)create that identity on a continual basis. What we say influences how we imagine the context, and the context in turn, influences what we say. This reciprocity between language and reality is commonly referred to as 'reflexivity' (Gee, 2005, p. 97). Texts emerge from context, but they also play a role in constructing context.

Historical and institutional factors also accompany language in use, as well as the social relationships and identities of those involved (Gee, 2005). Luke (1995) writes that "text analysis, like text construction, is a situated, motivated and provisional act reflecting a particular historical location and position itself with material consequences in the shaping of institutional practices" (p. 21). While seeking to understand context is an important part of discourse analysis, it also raises another dilemma, or what Gee (2011) refers to as the 'frame problem'. Context affects meaning, and as such, it is incumbent upon discourse analysts to consider context when interpreting any given language. However, the infinite scope of context creates the possibility that considering additional aspects of context shifts the interpretation of the text. Context is therefore "crucial to analyzing, interpreting, and generalizing findings" (Hornberger, 2015, p. 13).

In discussing the challenges inherent in attending to context, Gee (2004) asks, "Where do we cut off consideration of context? How can we be sure any interpretation is "right," if considering further aspects of the context might well change that interpretation?" (p. 27). While there is no easy answer to the 'frame problem', Gee (2011) suggests that discourse analysts can cultivate vigilance in seeking out contextual understandings that could refute current interpretations. In order to address the challenge

of the 'frame problem', the context must be continually widened until the interpretation no longer changes (Gee, 2004). This relates to the adequacy of data, a strategy for establishing validity which is taken up in greater detail in the final section of this chapter.

Establishing Validity and Trustworthiness

A significant goal for any researcher is to establish the validity and trustworthiness of a study. According to Gee (2011), validity and trustworthiness exist along a continuum, and while my efforts cannot guarantee 'correctness', my hope is that transparency about my findings allows others to view my work as a point of discovery and departure for future research into the ideologies of state-level language policy.

Validity

In certain schools of thought, arguments for validity appeal to a convincing degree of fit with reality. Within the theory of discourse analysis taken up in this paper, reality is constructed through language, therefore validity measures based on correct representations of reality are unsuitable (Gee, 2005). Instead, Gee (2011) highlights four elements that can contribute directly to the validity or 'trustworthiness' of discourse analysis: convergence, agreement, coverage and linguistic details. The first element, convergence, refers to the way in which an analysis is able to offer compatible answers to all of the questions being asked of the data. Although I chose not to address all of the 27 questions that Gee proposes, the analysis I offer in the following chapters demonstrates a certain degree of congruence. Where divergent answers do occur, I make note of them for the sake of transparency. The second element, agreement, calls attention to whether or not others concur with the findings. This is especially true for those whose social

languages are implicated in the data. To ascertain whether or not agreement existed for my findings, I chose to engage in an iterative process of member checking, which involved sharing my initial hypotheses with interview participants to determine the degree of resonance in the data. Gee (2005) writes that, "We very often run off too quickly with interpretations of what other people mean that are based on our own social and cultural worlds, not theirs" (p. xi). By engaging in the process of member checking, I was able to compare my interpretation with those of my interview participants. Where divergent interpretations emerged, I engaged in additional dialogue and reflection to forge deeper understanding.

The third element, coverage, looks at how the analysis can be applied across related sources of data. This relates to triangulation, one of the most established conditions for validity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To achieve coverage, I triangulated my data sources as described in the methodology section above by including the texts of the roadmaps themselves, interviews with key stakeholders involved in the development of the roadmaps, and ancillary artifacts that relate to each of the roadmap initiatives. These ancillary texts included proposed schedules and timelines of the work, demographic data collected through the roadmap processes, coeval documents and reports on language education, and related media releases. Together these data provided multiple sources of evidence to support the interpretation process. To ensure adequacy of data in both collection and interpretation, data was collected to completeness and redundancy and I immersed myself in data through repeated readings (Mullet, 2018).

The fourth element of validity specific to discourse analysis is linguistic details, which refers to how an analysis is directly connected to the structure of specific linguistic functions. Throughout my findings, I have drawn attention to certain details of language in my analysis, including linguistic complexity and lexical usage within each of the texts used for the study. Attending carefully to the details and structure of language lends soundness to my analysis and interpretation. Together, these four elements: convergence, agreement, coverage, and linguistic details support a claim of validity for this research.

Trustworthiness

In addition to establishing validity, qualitative research can also establish trustworthiness as an element of overall research credibility. On the issue of trust, researchers need to demonstrate whether their findings can be trusted to provide some version of the truth worth acting on, something that Lincoln & Guba (2000) refer to as catalytic authenticity. Catalytic authenticity is the ability of research to prompt action from the readers. On the issue of action, the findings of this research are written in part for the 42 states, including my home state of Minnesota, which have not yet drafted their own language roadmaps, as well as for the eight states that have published roadmaps and may be interested in future revisions.

The trustworthiness of findings in discourse analysis can be threatened when the research does not recognize multiple perspectives, including the positionality of the researcher themselves (Mullet, 2018). Researcher reflexivity and transparent articulation of positionality can be used to establish both validity and trustworthiness (Mullet, 2018). My own positionality was described in Chapter 1 of this study. In order to ensure that

multiple perspectives are recognized and included in the research, I turn again to the concept of data adequacy and 'completeness' (Mullet, 2018). While a study may never be fully complete because of the frame problem described above, ensuring a sense of completeness requires that researchers seek saturation in their data so that no new findings are revealed through new data. Through data collection and analysis, I immersed myself in multiple perspectives and readings to expand the scope of my understanding.

Trustworthiness also rests on the ethics of the researcher. Ethical issues can include how the researcher ensures informed consent, confidentiality and clear purposes for the research. These issues are presented more fully in Appendix D: Informed Consent. Ethics also includes the accessibility of data. As a researcher, it is important to me that all of the individuals and groups involved in the research are able to access the research in comprehensible ways (Mullet, 2018). It is also important for me as a researcher to acknowledge the ways in which research epistemologies have been influenced for many years by colonial perspectives of knowledge production (Ndimande, 2018). In light of this, Ndimande (2018) urges all scholars to "ask serious questions about the knowledge they produce and who benefits from it" (p. 383). This aligns with the critical questions posed by Tuhiwai Smith (2012) about whose interests are served by the research, who owns it, and how the findings will be disseminated. These questions compel me to pursue broad dissemination for my research, especially among policymakers and practitioners.

Limitations of the Study

Some of the potential limitations of this study include access to study participants, technology fatigue related to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the lack of longitudinal

data on the implementation of the roadmaps, and concerns from interview participants related to their own recollections. As a researcher, I recognize that access to interview participants is never guaranteed. Access to the people who participated in each of the language roadmaps was dependent on a variety of factors including availability, interest and trust. It was difficult to locate some of the individuals who participated in the earliest language roadmap initiatives. The sheer number of people who were involved in the development of the roadmaps, however, ameliorated some of the concerns related to this limitation. Because there were so many different individuals and organizations involved in the process, I was able to secure access to enough interview participants to create a sense of completeness with the findings.

Exhaustion with video conferencing, referred to in recent public discourse as 'Zoom fatigue' was an unanticipated limitation of my research that forced me to reconsider some of my initial research plans. When I began drafting my research plan, I had originally intended on conducting two rounds of interviews with participants, an initial round and then a follow-up round after some preliminary data analysis. As the COVID-19 pandemic stretched through the summer and fall of 2020, new realities began to take shape for many of us working in education. Our work transitioned largely online, and in-person classes and meetings were frequently replaced with synchronous, digital video meetings. As I began to speak to participants about next steps, it became clear that Zoom fatigue was a very real concern. Some participants even offered light-hearted suggestions about how to minimize the deleterious effects of lengthy virtual meetings. Based on these interactions, I decided to follow-up via email rather than a subsequent

video session. While some of the emails received no responses, other email threads generated rich and ongoing dialogue that supported me greatly in the evaluation and refinement of my analysis and interpretation.

Time was another significant limitation. The scale of this research project precluded a more lengthy, longitudinal study that could invest years in studying not only the development of the roadmaps, but their subsequent implementation and appropriation in particular spaces. While some of the earlier roadmaps have been formalized for a significant amount of time, the most recent roadmaps have only been operationalized for a year or two. A more longitudinal study would likely be able to better capture shifts in implementation over time. While the timing of this research cannot extend indefinitely, the conclusion of this particular research project does not and should not represent a culmination of research on this topic. Additional research projects could be conceived and carried out to continue the study of this topic in the future. Directions for future research are taken up with more detail in Chapter 7.

Moreover, because the interviews were conducted with participants who were involved in the language roadmap process at different points within the last fifteen years, including some who may have participated as early as 2007, recollection of certain details was raised by several participants as a potential concern. While I am not troubled by minor variability regarding the discrete details of the roadmap processes, I did want to honor participant voice by naming recollection as a limitation. Some participants described hesitance in even engaging in the interviews because of memory-related concerns, and I wonder if this concern played a role in several of the non-response

invitations I shared with participants in some of the earlier roadmap processes. A few participants began their interviews by issuing caveats related to the historical nature of the work and several described how, in their words, they "cheated" by reviewing a copy of the roadmap in advance of our meeting. To put participants at ease, I provided prompts as needed during the interview process regarding specific roadmap language. I also triangulated interview data with the texts of the roadmaps themselves and additional artifacts to support the adequacy of data interpretation through multiple sources of data and perspectives.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed description of the research methods used for my dissertation, including the study design, data collection procedures and approach to data analysis. The chapter began with the research questions for my work, which include:

A. What language ideologies exist in the text of language roadmaps?

B. What discourses exist surrounding the language roadmaps and their development?

C. How are these discourses and language ideologies evident in policy proposals?

In order to investigate these questions, I chose to conduct a qualitative policy discourse analysis. This design reflects my own epistemological orientation towards interpretivist and constructivist research methods that understand knowledge as something that is constructed and mediated through different perspectives and social interaction as well as a critical orientation that seeks to critique the existing systems of power and privilege. The approach to data analysis used in this study centers on discourse analysis, drawing largely from the work of Gee (2004, 2011).

The data sources used in the study include the texts of eight state language roadmaps, coeval documents related to the language roadmap initiatives in each state, and interviews with key informants from the development of each state roadmap. This chapter also sought to establish a more dynamic understanding of context that extends beyond geography to include aspects of time and social interaction as well as the economic and political forces that influence interpretation. I attended to the issues of validity and trustworthiness by explaining the myriad strategies used throughout this study to establish credibility, including the triangulation of data sources and researcher reflexivity. The chapter concluded with a discussion of several limitations, including participant access, technology fatigue, the lack of longitudinal implementation data, and the potential impact of state language roadmap timelines. The following chapters present the findings and interpretations from my study. I have organized my findings into three distinct chapters: Chapter 4 presents information on how the roadmaps converged to promote linguistic consciousness through public discourse, Chapter 5 presents the role of neoliberal discourse with attention to the language of economics, and Chapter 6 centers equity as a critical feature of language education policy.

Chapter 4: Promoting Linguistic Consciousness through Public Discourse

This chapter presents the ideologies evident in language roadmaps by examining how public discourse is used to establish and maintain beliefs about the value of multilingualism, specifically around the language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984). I begin by overviewing the myriad discursive and material benefits that are ascribed to language education and multilingualism while also examining the intentional ways in which language roadmaps converge to reproduce this messaging in the public domain. This discursive policy alignment is contrasted with two potentially divergent responses to language conscientization. The chapter ends with implications for future language policy, including attention to interest convergence within public awareness campaigns.

Establishing the Value of Language through Public Discourse

Across all eight state language roadmaps reviewed for this study, there was convergence in the abundance of benefits that were ascribed to multilingualism. The roadmaps described numerous benefits related to the language-as-resource orientation, including macro-level arenas of economics, national security, and legal compliance and micro-level benefits related to relationships, cognition, and life itself. While the roadmaps varied in the scale and scope of attention given to each of the benefits described below, their collective representation illustrates the heterogeneity within instrumentalist views of language.

Economic

The discourse surrounding language as a resource with economic value is addressed in greater detail in the following chapter, but it is worth opening this section

with a brief overview of the economic benefits of multilingualism because of the predominance of this narrative across all the language roadmaps. It is also worth stating once again that the discourse present in the roadmap did not emerge in a vacuum, but was instead influenced by a number of isomorphic factors, including the request for proposals described in Chapter 1, and by the collection of stakeholders that were involved in each roadmap initiative. Within the roadmaps and the surrounding discourse, the economic benefits of language were referenced at individual and institutional levels, as well as at the state level. The quote below from the Wisconsin Language Roadmap highlights the connection between language and the economic affairs of a state. The roadmap states:

> Languages matter because languages *work*. Languages *work* to sustain and improve the *economic vitality* of the state, particularly as globalization transforms the landscape of Wisconsin workplaces and community life (Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative, 2018, p. 3, *emphasis added*).

In the first two sentences, the subject of the transitive verb *work* is languages. The use of the verb *work* connotes employment, a lexical choice that underscores the proliferation of economic discourse throughout the roadmaps. Omitting the verb *work* in the second sentence would not significantly alter the meaning of the sentence, so a thorough discourse analysis would ask us to consider what is accomplished through its inclusion. An alternative rendering of the second sentence without the verb *work* could read "Languages sustain and improve the economic vitality of the state [...]". The inclusion of *work*, therefore, while not necessary for the meaning of the sentence, represents a discursive choice to strengthen the value of language as an active economic resource, in addition to the more explicit connection to *economic vitality*. While much more can be

said about the language of economics within the roadmaps, additional analysis will be taken up in Chapter 5 which narrows in more directly on the economic benefits ascribed to multilingualism, with specific attention to how the discourse in language roadmaps reifies the neoliberal commodification of language as a resource with economic value.

National Security

In addition to establishing the economic value of language, the discourse in and around state language roadmaps also evidenced the value of multilingualism for national security. The emphasis on language as a resource to support national security is unsurprising given the funding mechanisms in place across all eight roadmaps. As discussed in Chapter 1, all eight roadmaps received support from the Language Flagship initiative of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) which is itself a subsidiary of the Department of Defense. The following quote from the Ohio Language Roadmap (2007) illustrates how multilingualism is connected not only to the economy, but to state and national security:

> Ohioans with professionally useful foreign language ability will create positive, trusting relationships with people of other cultures. These relationships will lead to the creation of new jobs and businesses. By leading the nation in strengthening global economic ties, Ohioans in turn will lead the nation in strengthening state and national security (p. 4).

This quote highlights a transactional view of relationships whereby the 'positive, trusting relationships' created through multilingualism are used to enhance economic benefits and strengthen national security. National security is positioned as an altruistic goal of language education. By framing the benefits of multilingualism at the macro level of economics and national security, discourse surrounding the roadmaps appeals to a

collective orientation. A roadmap participant from Indiana highlighted the division between individual and collective goals by saying:

> You know, it's not just world language teachers saying there's a reason for us to have jobs, you know, it's saying like, this is tied to national security. This is tied to our economic strength in the world. This is tied to, you know, how we live in our communities, you know, this is very valuable, to do this process (Interview with Indiana Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

In this quote, the value of language education is tied first and foremost to national security. While it is acknowledged that world language teachers could have proclivity towards promoting multilingualism for professional reasons, this concession is understated in favor of the collective benefits of national security, economic strength and community living. This collective orientation toward the benefits of multilingualism advances a view of language education as being good not just for individual career aspirations, but for socially selfless reasons. National security is not, however, an entirely compassionate endeavor. Historically, national security initiatives have advanced a particular view of nationalism and 'Americanness' that establish the speakers of certain languages as a potential threat to national security. The connection between language and national identity can be seen in the quote below from another roadmap participant:

> How in the hell do you build for a long-term project? The only way to do it is kind of try to create a politically, a political environment where say studying Chinese is not going to be considered, like you're preparing students to be traitors to their country or something. I often get criticized for not being quite, real American. Because of the Chinese. Sometimes, this hasn't happened for a while, but I used to get it all the time (Interview with Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

The othering of speakers of languages beyond English as not being a "real American" highlights how the supposed collective benefits of multilingualism are not always

distributed equitably across society. Based on political reasons, proficiency in certain languages may carry more risk than reward. When coupled with raciolinguistic ideologies, the inequitable distribution becomes even more apparent. Discourse that positions multilingualism as a collective benefit for national security obscures how individuals and institutions may be differentially impacted by language education based not only on underlying political affairs, but also on the perceived racialization of language speakers. The question of who benefits from multilingualism must be addressed with attention to the overt power dynamics of national security.

The hegemony of national security initiatives is reinforced in part through the allocation of financial resources. With the largest federal investment in language education, the role of the Department of Defense in the promotion of multilingualism needs to be interrogated. The use of funding from Language Flagship and NSEP for postsecondary language programs, including state language roadmap initiatives, was not without concern and critique among roadmap participants. One participant noted:

> I think we have to be honest about it and say, you know, we benefited from the National Security initiatives and that program, but let's be careful that we don't undermine our core values of what language education should be, you know, we do want to continue language education to be somewhat subversive and, you know, in the ways that it promotes, you know, promotes things that maybe are not what people think of as national security priorities (Interview with Utah Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

Viewing language education as a subversive force rebukes the generic notion of multilingualism as a collective benefit for the security of the nation. While language can be used as a resource for maintaining social order and political hegemony, roadmap participants also maintained that language can be a disruptive force used to advance

social change. Promoting language education and multilingualism for the purposes of national security reinforces a view of language as a public good, but this collectivist view also obscures how the benefits of multilingualism are distributed unequally based on politics and race and discounts the potentially subversive role of language education to disrupt current power structures.

Legal Compliance

In addition to affordances related to economic competitiveness and national security, multilingualism is also promoted within the roadmaps as a necessary component of compliance at the institutional level. For hospitals, schools, courtrooms and other public entities, the ability to communicate in languages beyond English is more than just a preference - it is often a legal mandate. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) describes this necessity as follows:

> From a state and local government perspective, if agencies do not have the necessary language capacities, clients who may not yet speak English may be blocked from accessing state services and resources to which they are legally entitled, such as healthcare assistance and legal services (p. 5).

Established legal entitlements to translation and interpretation services raise significant questions about language access and equity. While some legal statutes are unambiguous in the way they lay out language responsibilities and rights, others have more space for interpretation, leading to differential levels of implementation. The language access statutes included in the Minnesota Learning English for Academic Proficiency and Success (LEAPS) Act is an example of the latter. By inserting caveats of practicability into state legislation regarding language rights, schools were given interpretive latitude

that ultimately hindered meaningful implementation of language access for multilingual families within Minnesota schools. By arguing for expanded language education and promoting multilingualism as an issue of language access and equity, state language roadmaps couple the language-as-resource orientation with the language-as-right orientation. Within this discourse, language is a resource for institutions and agencies to be able to fulfill legal mandates, but it is also a right for individuals to be able to access legal, health and educational services in a language they understand. The following sections look deeper at the individual benefits ascribed to multilingualism and language education.

Relationships

In addition to benefits at the macro level, the discourse in and around the roadmaps also highlighted how multilingualism can provide specific benefits at the micro, or individual level. The quotes below from the Ohio and Utah Language Roadmaps introduce language learning as an advantage for building trusting relationships, while also creating ambiguity in the function of relationships:

> Learning the languages and cultures of those with whom we interact will enhance our ability to build the trusting relationships on which Ohio's success in the world depends (Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 3)

> Top purposes for advanced competence in the use of world languages include:
> a. development of trust through advanced language and cultural competence
> (Utah Language Roadmap Initiative, 2009, p. 5)

Although I am framing the relational benefit of multilingualism as a micro-level benefit, I also recognize the ways in which individual relationships can play a significant role within and between institutions and even between nation-states. A trusting relationship

can be a component of individual self-fulfillment, but it can also be a means for strategic diplomacy or economic development. When Ohio's success in the world is predicated on trusting relationships, it is unlikely that the relationships being referred to are the idiosyncratic relations that characterize an individual's social circle, but rather strategic associations that have significant implications for economic and national security. The term *success* generally connotes accomplishment and economic prosperity, and when applied to a state, the implication is that a diversity of linguistic skills will support stronger relationships which will in turn support a stronger economy.

The purpose and function of trusting relationships cultivated on the basis of language skills is even more abstruse in the example from Utah. The development of trust is listed as an example of one of the top purposes for advanced linguistic competence, but the ultimate aim of that trust is left unstated. While it could be said that the development of trust is meant to support individual well-being and self-actualization, it is also possible that the development of trust is viewed as a precursor to economic prosperity, or even as a facet of strategic diplomacy or national security initiatives. In any case, the discourse in and around the roadmaps recognize language skills as a contributing factor to building trusting relationships and seek to promote language education by calling attention to this correspondence.

Cognitive and Academic

Another individual benefit of multilingualism cited to advance language education relates to an increasing body of scholarship on how language learning impacts cognitive development. According to the Rhode Island Language Roadmap (2012):

> There is increasing evidence that studying a second language, at an early age, increases a child's cognitive skills and leads to better overall academic performance, particularly in core subjects (p. 16).

This argument appeals to students, families, and education leaders who are under increasing pressure to demonstrate academic achievement and growth. Connecting language learning with better academic performance marks a clear departure from the language-as-problem orientation that has been regularly enacted in schools to pathologize language learners, especially those who speak languages beyond English in their homes and communities. While differential dispositions towards language learners based on home languages still exist, discourse that advances the cognitive and academic benefits of multilingualism plays a role in shifting the conversation to more asset-orientated educational approaches. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap (2018) identifies some of the specific cognitive functions that can be developed through language education:

> The very process of language learning develops students' analytic capacities and critical-thinking abilities, as well as important life skills such as listening, cooperating, negotiating meaning, and problem solving (p. 3).

Unlike the benefits of multilingualism described across earlier domains, the cognitive and academic benefits of language learning are not tied to any particular degree of competence. Instead, the discourse in and around the roadmaps position language education as having value in its very process, regardless of proficiency level.

Life and Death

An additional theme of benefits related to multilingualism centered on how language ability can mediate vitally important information, especially in the health care

setting. The following quotes, from the texts of the roadmaps and from participant interviews illustrate how multilingualism can be positioned as an issue of life and death:

> The domestic team identifies critical needs that involve public safety, family security, and even life and death issues in health and rescue situations (Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 15).
>
> In hospital emergency rooms, a lack of multiple language capacity may even be an issue of life and death (Texas Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 5).
>
> In this COVID situation, it's no longer a nice-to-have, it's a lifesaving, to be able to communicate with these communities (Interview with Hawai‘i Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).
>
> In some cases, there are life and death decisions that depend upon language competency of health providers for example. We're feeling that very much today (Interview with Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

In each of these examples, multilingualism is valued for its role in interpreting essential information related to safety, security and life itself. The participant responses reference the current health crisis of COVID-19 during which the interviews were conducted. With staggering rates of illness and death being shared by state agencies and national media, the topic of the pandemic was referenced in many of the interviews, including examples like those above which connect language skills with the ability to provide appropriate health care services to those in need.

The benefits of multilingualism are wide-ranging, from the macro-level to the micro-level and the liminal spaces in between. From an economic standpoint, multilingualism offers local and international businesses opportunities for increased profit through expanded customer bases and corporate connections. Language skills can be an advantage for public diplomacy and national security as well as for any institution

seeking greater compliance with state and federal policy. As equity continues to become a more pressing issue through current events and politics, the issue of language access may become increasingly important for institutions and agencies that want to maintain a public image not just of compliance, but of commitment. The language-as-resource orientation blends with the language-as-right orientation when we consider the role that language plays in building and maintaining relationships, advancing academic achievement, and accessing services that are critical to life itself.

Campaigning for Public Awareness

Based on the examples above, there are myriad ways in which individuals and institutions can talk about the benefits of multilingualism. The decision to talk about the benefits of language learning in one way or another rests both on an awareness of each particular discourse, as well as on the audience engaged in dialogue. When speaking to a business community, a focus on the economic benefits would be apposite and understandable. Within the judicial system, one can imagine a focus on legal compliance through language access and equity. The objectives of the Language Flagship, which provided both fiscal and consultative support to the roadmap initiatives, undeniably influenced the prominence of certain discourses within the roadmap documents. The audience of the roadmaps, therefore, necessarily includes the Language Flagship as the sponsors of the initiative, but the messaging of the benefits of bilingualism, and the recommendations made in each of the roadmaps to advance language education also provide additional insight into the imagined audience for each document.

When analyzing *Discourse*, Gee (2005) asks us to consider "What sorts of texts, media, experiences, interactions, and/or institutions could have given rise to these Discourse models?" (p. 93). When it comes to *Discourse* about bilingualism, the language roadmaps sponsored by the Language Flagship are one type of text that has advanced a particular narrative about language education. The audience of these roadmaps inform and are informed by the different ways in which the benefits of multilingualism are framed. As a response to the identified benefits of multilingualism described above, all of the roadmaps proposed a certain degree of public conscientization around the issue of language. This conscientization often took the form of explicit campaigns to market and promote not only the benefits described above, but the specific recommendations included in the roadmaps as well.

The recommendations within the roadmaps were targeted to a range of stakeholders, including educational leaders, businesses entities, governmental agencies and state-level policymakers. These stakeholders both informed and were informed by the *Discourse* of the roadmaps. A careful consideration of audience is an important element of discourse analysis, not only because of the reciprocity between expression and interpretation, but also because the imagined audience can provide insight into the material consequences of a particular *Discourse*. Valdez et al. (2016) write about how the marketing audience of language education can signal the potential distribution of benefits. Different messages about the benefits of multilingualism support different *Discourses* and serve different audiences.

Advocating for Awareness

Because the roadmaps are publicly available documents, the potential audiences are myriad. One of the reasons I first became aware of the roadmaps was through conversations with language advocates, or more narrowly stated, individuals who were and are interested in advancing policies and practices to increase attention towards and accessibility of equitable language education. Many of the participants who engaged in interviews with me shared similar ambitions to reject the current status quo and advocate for changes in the way their state approached multilingualism and language education. In examining the challenges inherent in advocacy, the significance of intentional marketing campaigns surfaced as an explicit recommendation in both the roadmaps and in interview discussions. The Indiana Language Roadmap Initiative (2019) lays out the fundamental elements of an awareness campaign in the following quote:

> The success of the Indiana Language Roadmap will require a communications and educational strategy that raises the profile of the overall project priorities and goals, articulates the needs for the initiative, and informs Indiana residents about the state's many global connections and communities. An awareness campaign should start immediately. Clearly defined messages about Indiana's diversity and the economic value and social benefits of world language skills and global competencies must be widely disseminated, using new and established networks and various mediums of communication (p. 19).

In this example, the authors of the Indiana Language Roadmap set forth the rationale, substance, timing and methods of a campaign to advance public awareness. There is explicit attention to conscientization on the diversity within Indiana and on the "economic value and social benefits" of language. This messaging campaign is proposed to be carried out through "new and established networks and various mediums of

communication". The use of comprehensive marketing strategies was echoed in conversation with interview participants. Some participants recommended pursuing greater publicity through the recruitment of notable and popular public figures like athletes or entertainers, while other suggested increasing engagement with local businesses and community organizations, or mobilizing public offices and candidates, as evidenced in the quote below:

> That changing the narrative problem is kind of a particularly tricky one. And I'm not sure how to approach that. It's really kind of a, I mean, it helps to have outspoken public leadership. I wish we could have; it was good that the governor attended all of our events, but I wish we had had more publicity, more prominence of the program. It would have been, nowadays I would, I would have someone working very hard on, not only on those events but on, on social media and traditional media and trying to influence the way people think about things. I'm not sure exactly how I would do it, but people need to be talking, people need to be influencing each other. It needs to become part of public discourse. Candidates for office need to be talking about it (Interview with Hawai'i Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

The challenge of marketing a certain narrative looks different today than it did when the first roadmaps were written in 2007. The evolution of social media and the ongoing politicization of traditional media necessitate a certain degree of innovation within any public awareness campaign. Regardless of the methods chosen, the process of changing public discourse about a given topic is not one that should be taken up without careful consideration of consequence. Choosing to promote a particular message about the benefits of language can reinforce particular linguistic ideologies. The following section addresses how the ideas and messages about language shared within public awareness campaigns can themselves become commodified through neoliberal discourse.

“Selling” Language Discourse

In addition to the commodification of linguistic and cultural skills which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, discourse in and around the language roadmaps also demonstrated how particular ideas about language could themselves be marketed within a neoliberal orientation towards language. In the examples below, participants from three different state roadmaps initiatives use merchandising language to talk about how multilingualism and language education were promoted within their settings.

The first example below begins with a direct comparison to the state of Utah. The state of Utah was lauded in many of the interviews as a strong example of dual immersion programming that is supported at the state level. The perceived success of the Utah model was attributed by many to established religious traditions that encourage mission work outside of the United States:

> Utah has the Mormon culture that values knowing languages, so the community understanding of learning language and the benefits of it, didn't have, you didn't have to, the people in Utah didn't have *to sell that*. But we had *to sell it*. We had *to sell the idea* that Americans could actually learn Chinese, work in Chinese, that whole idea (Interview with Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative Participant, *emphasis added*).

In this example, three consecutive clauses use the transitive verb ‘to sell’, a verb choice that is closely aligned to the language of economics used throughout the texts of the roadmap documents. In the clause, “the people in Utah didn't have *to sell that*”, the speaker uses the demonstrative ‘that’ as the object of the verb ‘to sell’. The use of the demonstrative refers back to the previous clause calling attention to the community understanding of the benefits of learning language. In the next clause, ‘But we had *to sell*

it", the speaker replaces the demonstrative with the definite pronoun 'it'. At this point in the text, the pronoun 'it' refers back to the same antecedent as the demonstrative 'that'. Both deictics are indexing back to the community understanding. In the final clause, the speaker repeats the same subject and verb, but extends the object of the verb 'to sell' to specify that what is being sold is "the idea that Americans could actually learn Chinese, work in Chinese".

The deictic chaining in these clauses draws a direct connection between what the speaker identifies as "community understanding of learning language and the benefits of it" and the idea of learning and working in Chinese. The community understanding is connected to reinforcing American capacity to learn language and the subsequent benefit of learning language is connected to working in another language. While the speaker did not explicitly list the benefits of learning language, by chaining deictic references, the speaker is asserting in a less direct way that working in another language is a benefit of learning language. The alignment between multilingualism and career aspirations alludes to many of the benefit claims made in the language roadmap documents.

The second example of merchandising language in action is taken from a section of dialogue with an interview participant from the state of Hawai'i. In this excerpt, the speaker is discussing the process of building partnerships outside the field of language education, including with business, community and government agencies.

> But takes a while for them [other sectors] to trust you. You have to be at the same meetings that they're at. You have to talk with them at lunch. It's just like any other relationship, nobody's going *to buy into language*, if it's not a language person, until they understand what *you're selling* (Interview with Hawaii Language Roadmap Participant, *emphasis added*).

Here we see the merchandising terms *buy* and *sell* being used once again to commodify ideas about language. "To buy into language" in the context of work on the roadmap initiatives calls to mind a certain degree of transactional investment. If advocates of language and language education want the discursive and material support of other sectors, there are certain relational activities that must be enacted. One of these activities is to sell, or market, language education in a way that is understandable. A key function of marketing is in understanding the audience you are marketing to and tailoring the message in such a way that it resonates with the audience in question. The focus on trust and relationship building within this excerpt serves a practical function in creating the conditions for effective marketing practices.

In the third example, an interview participant from Wisconsin describes the process of gathering comments from businesses and other community organizations to be included in the text of the roadmap document. Five of the eight language roadmaps included direct quotes from local businesses related to language and multilingualism. The participant describes this process by saying:

> So it's kind of *shopping around* and figuring out who is going to get you, who is going to get you kind of in the door of these business places to get their, their, their comments on record. Yeah, because that's, that's gonna be the *selling point* especially for something that's, for like a bipartisan document. People, funders, they want to see that. And, and language learners want to hear it too. They like to know that there is *this kind of intrinsic value* to their language study (Interview with Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative Participant, *emphasis added*).

The use of *shopping around* and *selling point* once again draw on the language of economics and consumerism, this time as part of the policy development process itself.

Using deictics once again, we see the demonstrative 'that' referring back to the previous clause of getting "comments on record". While unstated, the comments referred to by this clause are comments that affirm bilingualism as an asset. The nature and content of the comments in question did not need to be stated directly because they are included in the text of the roadmap documents, and the speaker was aware of my familiarity with the texts. The *selling point* the speaker refers to is getting comments on record from the business community that affirm the value and benefits of multilingualism and language education. This underscores a belief that validation from the business community makes ideas about language eminently more marketable. This belief is reinforced by stakeholder involvement in the roadmap initiative process. In explaining the inclusion of significant numbers of stakeholders from the business community, as documented in the acknowledgements section in seven of the eight roadmaps, another interview participant remarked, "That's when people pay attention."

In addition to business validation as a selling point for the community in general, and for funders more specifically, the speaker also calls attention to language learners by stating, "They [language learners] like to know that there is *this kind of intrinsic value* to their language study". Here the speaker connects approbation from the business community as a kind of value that is inherent in learning language. Typologizing valuation from the business community as an intrinsic value demonstrates an embedded belief in the language-as-resource orientation. An intrinsic value is generally defined as something that is innate and inherent. The dynamic profit motive of businesses suggests that any potential affirmations of language are contingent at best. Nonetheless, the

economic, social and political power of the business community in a global, neoliberal economy creates space for even the most contingent affirmations to carry significant weight, a topic which is taken up in greater detail in Chapter 5 through analysis of the discursive relationship between neoliberalism and language ideology.

The discourse in and around the roadmaps converged not only on the wide-ranging benefits ascribed to multilingualism through a language-as-resource orientation, but also on explicit recommendations to advance public awareness and conscientization around language through intentional marketing campaigns. These marketing strategies created space for the direct commodification of ideas about language. The following section examines the divergent rhetorical responses that emerged within the language roadmaps regarding public awareness of the benefits of language learning.

Divergent Discourse on Public Language Awareness

As stated above, a campaign for public awareness was a recommendation or strategy in all eight of the roadmaps being studied. These public awareness campaigns focused largely on increasing awareness of the benefits of bilingualism and were often targeted towards a variety of audiences, including individuals in the general public as well as corporate and governmental entities. A key factor in understanding these campaigns is in how the benefits of bilingualism are presented. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007), for example, states that,

> The larger goal of these PSAs [Public Service Announcements] is to demonstrate that both individuals and society as a whole are better served if public entities such as legal services, law enforcement, and healthcare systems have the multilingual workforce they need *at their disposal* (p.14, *emphasis added*).

The use of the word *disposal* clearly indicates once again a language-as-resource orientation. A closer examination of deixis also provides insight into who is benefiting from this resource use. In this case, *their* refers back not to individuals or society as a whole, but to the public entities listed, namely the legal services, law enforcement and healthcare systems. These entities can be understood to provide better services to society if they are able to make use of multilingual workers. While the use of *at your disposal* is an idiomatic phrase that is frequently used within the service industry, the choice of the term *disposal* reinforces a utilitarian belief in language as a tool. In everyday vernacular, to dispose of something generally refers to discarding something that is no longer of use. To have a multilingual workforce *at your disposal* positions multilingual workers as expendable and able to be discarded based on shifting language 'needs' of the public. The potentially mutable needs of the business sector parallel the uneven levels of language awareness ascribed to the general public. The following sections explore two divergent sets of beliefs about the needs of the public related to language awareness.

Limited Language Awareness

There were two threads of discourse about public language awareness woven throughout the language in and around the roadmaps. On the one hand, some of the roadmaps and interview participants positioned public awareness about language issues as a deficit. Conflicting discourse, however, suggested abundant, and even universal awareness about the benefits of cross-cultural and plurilingual competence. The first two quotes below, taken from the text of the roadmaps themselves, illustrate beliefs around limited language awareness across broad sectors of the general public:

> It was disheartening, however, to find that many sectors of the population do not appreciate the practical advantages of being able to communicate in multiple languages (Texas Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 4).

> The results of the language demand assessment made by CASLS verify the growing need for language skills in Oregon. In addition to this study, studies by the Council on Economic Development, the Modern Language Association, the Council of Europe, and others confirm the centrality of languages to economic, social, and intellectual vigor. These studies, however, have not entered the consciousness of our monolingual society. It is difficult to explain the value of speaking another language to those who have never done so (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 13).

These examples underscore the 'practical advantages' and 'value' of multilingualism while also asserting a lack of appreciation and consciousness relative to those benefits. Interview participants reiterated similar messaging in our conversations about marketing campaigns, and in some cases provided additional insights into why public discourse around multilingualism might be limited. In describing the challenges of the roadmap initiative, one participant stated:

> The whole thing was hard. I mean, starting at the biggest level, you know, I mean, this is the challenge of my whole career and if you stay in the language education business, it'll be yours. You know, trying to promote bilingualism in a monolingual culture, right? And we aren't really a monolingual culture, but the power structure is largely monolingual (Interview with Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

Within this quote, the need to promote bilingualism is connected directly to monolingual power structures. This shifts the conversation away from viewing limited public awareness of language as a function of mere ignorance, but rather as a systemic and structural condition resulting from hegemonic monoglossic orientations. Because systems of power are designed to perpetuate themselves, the challenge of 'shifting the narrative' becomes a very real consideration. Not all the roadmaps, however, approached the issue

of public language awareness from a structural, deficit orientation. The following section highlights a more generous attribution of understanding that situates the challenge not in the discursive promotion of multilingualism, but in the material implementation of bilingual policies and practices.

Abundant Language Awareness

In contrast to the narratives about limited language awareness, some roadmaps and participants described a degree of consciousness that does fully recognize the myriad benefits of multilingualism. While this discourse did not supplant calls for greater public awareness campaigns, it did seek to naturalize the benefits of multilingualism as incontrovertible. In the language roadmap examples below, linguistic competence and language education are granted a significant degree of recognition:

> It is universally recognized that linguistic and cultural competence is crucial to Utah's success as an emerging leader in a global market (Utah Language Roadmap Initiative, 2009, p. 4).

> 85% of Indiana teachers, educators, and administrators agree that world language instruction is important or very important (Indiana Language Roadmap Initiative, 2019, p. 9).

By granting the general public more abundant awareness and support of multilingualism and language learning, the focus of language conscientization would shift from acquisition of knowledge to operationalizing that information. One interview participant described the disconnect between knowledge and action below:

> And I mean everybody is supportive of language learning. Generally, who I spoke to, who knows anything about the issue from state legislators to folks in business, et cetera. But very few of them were willing to put their money where their mouth was (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

Support for language learning can take two forms, discursive support and material support. While the limited language awareness narrative focuses on garnering discursive support by increasing knowledge and understanding about the benefits of multilingualism, the abundant language awareness discourse acknowledges sufficient levels of understanding and seeks to secure material support.

Although I am presenting these two narratives as divergent forms of discourse, I would also argue that these two narratives do not represent mutually exclusive binaries, but rather points along a continuum of appreciation that can and do co-exist with one another. As these two narratives interact with one another, we begin to see a more nuanced picture which acknowledges the presence and representation of both dialogues in different settings. The final section of this chapter addresses some of the implications for language policy based on the convergences and divergences introduced above.

Implications for Language Policy

Across all of the roadmaps, there was convergence in promoting greater conscientization around language. The participants in the roadmap initiatives were intentional about establishing goals that advance multilingualism and language education within their states through a variety of discourse strategies and policy recommendations. Beliefs about language and language awareness play a significant role in the articulation of specific policy recommendations. The findings introduced in this chapter provide insight and understanding into how the intersections and variances of language beliefs influence consequent proposals. The implications of leaning into one discourse or another are consequential for the design, development and implementation of specific language

policies and practices. This section addresses some of the potential implications when advocates and policymakers lean into particular beliefs about the function and role of linguistic conscientization.

Many of the roadmaps use limited language awareness as a rationale for explicit marketing campaigns. While the correspondence between a lack of linguistic consciousness and the need for public engagement is convincing, it is not complete. By positioning the need for language conscientization as a function of limited linguistic knowledge, the role of power and privilege is obscured. Awareness is an essential but insufficient element of implementation. While social changes can be advanced through consciousness raising (Gal, 1989), awareness is only one element of change. The consciousness raising promoted through the roadmaps takes a necessary step towards effective policy promotion but falls short in fully accomplishing the roadmap goals.

In order to realize the recommendations of the roadmaps more fully, changing beliefs about language must be accompanied by understanding how change is complicated by the current systems and structures of power. Fairclough (2003) writes that changing culture can be seen "partly as a matter of changing language" (p. 18). It is not enough, however, to argue for language change if there is not an accompanying social change. Public awareness campaigns may achieve a measure of success by shifting public discourse around multilingualism, but sustainable, material change must also include intentional efforts to dismantle hegemonic systems of power.

Earlier in this chapter, I presented some of the different potential audiences and stakeholder groups that likely influenced and were influenced by the discourse of the

roadmaps. This leads to a related discussion around interest convergence. Under the theory of interest convergence (Bell, 1980), action and change are not typically undertaken because of increasing moral understanding, but rather because of increasing alignment to the interests of those in power. While endeavoring to promote multilingualism may be seen as a noble goal, it is worth considering to what degree the recommendations within the roadmap also service the needs and interests of the multiple stakeholder groups that informed their development. The federal government, as represented by the National Security Education Program, has a vested interest in cultivating a potential candidate pool with the requisite language skills to be able to engage in national security initiatives. Businesses have a vested interest in recruiting and retaining multilingual talent in order to expand their business relations both domestically and internationally. The degree to which these interests converged within the roadmaps may be evidence to support Bell's (1980) theory that conscientization is not in fact the most effective catalyst for change, but rather that change is driven by increasing alignment to the beliefs and interests of those in power. This is not to say that the marketing endeavors articulated in the roadmaps are ill-conceived, but rather that efforts to raise awareness around language and language education must be understood in relation to the audience(s) in question, the language ideologies being espoused, and the power structures used to disseminate messaging about multilingualism.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I examined the benefits attributed to multilingualism and language learning through the discourse of the language roadmap initiatives. The roadmaps sought

to establish the value of language through public discourse across multiple sectors. I provided examples of discourse that positions multilingualism as a macro-level benefit for economic development, national security and legal compliance. I also examined some of the micro-level benefits attributed to language learning, including the development of trusting relationships, cognitive and academic achievement and even the protection of life itself. Messages about language education are reproduced in the roadmaps and in calls for more intentional public campaigning and marketing for multilingualism. Within this convergence, I highlighted two conflicting claims about the degree to which awareness of the benefits of multilingualism has become mainstream with implications for potential implementation. The significance of interest convergence was also discussed as an explanatory factor in advancing changes in public discourse. The following chapter narrows in on the discourse of economics as a salient theme across all roadmaps. Within Chapter 5, I present examples from the text of the roadmaps, related artifacts, and interview participants to illustrate the pervasiveness of neoliberal economic discourse in the promotion of language education along with potentially divergent responses to the economic value of language.

Chapter 5: The Role of Neoliberal Discourse in the Language of Economics

This chapter explores the language and ideologies of economics as one of the most pronounced discursive themes in the text of the language roadmaps. By analyzing the discourse in and around the language roadmaps, I draw attention to how the *discourse* of economics is used to mutually reinforce the *Discourse* of neoliberalism and language commodification. Within the linguistic convergence related to the language of economics, I present two divergent sets of ideological responses, one which views language as a potential investment opportunity for linguistic speculation and the other which views language as an opportunity for exploitation through expectations of linguistic generosity. These findings are presented in relationship to how specific economic discourses and ideologies about language might shape implications for the design and implementation of language education policy and practice.

Language as a Resource with Economic Value

In Chapter 2, I overviewed three language orientations proposed by Ruiz (1984), including language-as-problem, language-as-resource, and language-as-right. While all three of these orientations appear in different places throughout the texts of the roadmaps, accompanying artifacts and participant interviews, the most prominent orientation across all eight language roadmap initiatives was the instrumentalist language-as-resource orientation. This orientation was especially prominent in relation to the discourse of economics and neoliberalism. Like any field of study, the discourse of economics has particular linguistic features that set it apart from more general, quotidian language.

In particular, the discourse of economics maintains a particular lexicon of words and phrases that can be used to make connections between broader economic theories. Terms like competition, supply and demand, and opportunity cost have technical definitions within the domain of macroeconomics. The use of these terms in the language roadmaps, therefore, calls to mind connections between the promotion of multilingualism and the advancement of free market capitalism and neoliberalism. The following sections highlight some of the specific ways that competition, supply and demand, and opportunity cost appear in the *discourse* in and around the language roadmaps and how discursive choices are used to connect policy proposals in the roadmaps to the *Discourse* of neoliberalism.

Competition

One of the most prominent economic threads that is woven throughout the discourse of the language roadmap initiatives is that of competition. Across the language roadmap documents, language is frequently positioned as a resource that can be used by individuals, institutions, and nation-states to compete with one another. The example below highlights how competition is framed at an individual level.

> Leaders in government, education and business express the need to educate and prepare globally competent graduates capable of communicating, *competing*, and thriving in an increasingly complex world (Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative, 2012, p. 16, *emphasis added*).

This excerpt from Rhode Island highlights a need expressed by various sector leaders for graduates who are able to compete with one another within "an increasingly complex world". The complexity addressed in this example calls to mind the dynamic nature of

globalization and transnationalism that has continued to disrupt simplistic and bounded understandings of government, education and business. The capacity to compete is positioned as a necessary component of individual competence within the world. The next example, from the Oregon Language Roadmap (2007), describes the significance of competition through the lens of commerce by stating:

> Businesses realize that an internationally literate citizenry projects a cosmopolitan image that can be a significant *competitive advantage* in attracting talent, capital, and tourists (p. 4, *emphasis added*).

In this example, the phrase "internationally literate" is used as a proxy for cultural and linguistic proficiency in a language beyond English. The *competitive advantage* described in the text is secured by virtue of a perceived "cosmopolitan image" that is generated through the idea of international literacy. In the third example from the Hawai'i Language Roadmap Initiative (2013), language study is positioned as a requirement for state competition at a global level:

> To *compete* in a global economy and to respond to the demands of its increasingly diverse population Hawai'i must promote and support the study of foreign languages and cultures (p. 12, *emphasis added*).

This focus on economic competitiveness, imbued throughout the text of the roadmaps, was also evident in the discourse surrounding the development of the roadmap documents. In describing the perceived goal of the roadmap initiative, one interview participant reported:

> We got the grant because, as I'm sure you know, from DOD [Department of Defense] basically with this idea of developing world language education in the state for this kind of like this *instrumental purpose of economic competitiveness* (Interview with Wisconsin Language Roadmap Participant, *emphasis added).*

A number of interview participants reflected directly on the discourse of economic competitiveness as an articulated and instrumental benefit of multilingualism and language education. The focus on competition was driven in part by an external emphasis from the Language Flagship. The stated objectives of the most recent RFP for language roadmap initiatives calls on states to identify the "future language and cultural skills needed for a *competitive workforce* that can function locally and globally" (Language Flagship, 2017, *emphasis added*; See Appendix B). The prominence of competition as a discursive theme throughout the language roadmaps was supported by additional discourse choices related to the language of economics, including the areas of supply and demand and opportunity cost, each of which are discussed in more detail below.

Supply and Demand

The economic language of supply and demand appeared across many of the language roadmap documents. In the context of language education, the term 'supply' was often used to refer to the available quantity of world language speakers, while 'demand' referred to the need for world language speakers across a variety of domains. Roadmap initiatives frequently used the language of supply and demand to communicate the need for enhancing and expanding current language education pathways. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) asks:

> How well is the State of Texas meeting the current and future needs of businesses operating in a globalized economy and government agencies facing a rapidly diversifying population? All indications are that the existing *supply* of proficient speakers of languages other than English is inadequate to meet the *current demand*, much less any *future demand* (p. 7).

The use of *supply* and *demand* in this text makes it clear that the current and future

demand for proficient speakers of language other than English is being driven in large part by the needs of businesses and global agencies. As articulated in this example, the demand for language is not being driven by a desire for linguistic justice, but by an instrumentalist view of language as a resource to be produced and consumed by society. Some of the actors within each state roadmap initiative also leaned into this language of supply and demand. One participant described the work by saying:

> But the objective was really to assess the need, as articulated by the demand sector. Now the demand sector might be the hospitals or it might be the fire department or might be in the hospitality sector, particularly in a place like Honolulu, but the overall goal was to match up that articulated demand with what could be planned for in the future to respond to that demand (Interview with Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

In this example, the demand sector is expanded beyond the business community to include health and human service agencies like hospitals and fire departments. The use of supply and demand in this context illustrates the wide-ranging application of economic language. In the field of microeconomics, supply and demand are understood as factors that can be used to inform price determination. When applied more broadly to other enterprises, the notions of supply and demand become key factors in informed decision-making processes. The application of the language of supply and demand and related business models to the promotion of multilingualism parallels some of the broader market reforms that have been implemented in education over the last few decades. Market reformers maintain that introducing greater competition and economic principles like supply and demand into schools will lead to greater effectiveness and efficiency.

Opportunity Costs

Another lexical connection to the language of economics can be seen in the indexing of the phrase 'opportunity costs'. In microeconomic terms, an opportunity cost refers to something that is lost because of a choice between alternatives. If a business chooses to invest all of their resources, including both financial and non-fiduciary resources, in one product, they would theoretically lose out on potential gains from investing in an alternative product. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) describes the significance of this potential loss by stating that:

> The opportunity costs resulting from the lack of a linguistically and culturally competent workforce are considerable. From a business viewpoint, an inability to respond to needs articulated in unfamiliar languages and contexts limits a company's possible customer base (p. 5, *emphasis added*)

In this example, the opportunity cost for businesses without multilingual and multicultural employees is a limited customer base, which could be extrapolated and understood as a limited potential for profit. Interviews with language roadmap participants supported this interpretation by delineating some of the specific losses that could be incurred by businesses that do not employ multilingual staff. One participant described these costs by stating:

> We do know that there are lots of *opportunity costs*, if you only employ English speaking tech, you know, sales tech forces, who then have to sell your product to, you know, customers in Mexico or customers in China and if they don't speak the language, there will be warranty costs that are rising and, you know, they cannot, cannot connect, they won't build the rapport with the customers and so on (Interview with Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

While opportunity costs could be seen as an inevitable part of making choices, both at individual and institutional levels, the term connotes a sense of scarcity and positions

decision-making as a zero-sum endeavor in which each choice implies a potential loss. By associating the quantity of multilingual employees with greater potential profit, the linguistic repertoires of individual employees are commodified as resources that can be exploited for profit motives. The following section looks more closely at the ways in which language is commodified through the *Discourse* of neoliberalism.

Commodification of Language through Neoliberalism

The language of economics, as exemplified through the use of lexical items like competition, supply and demand and opportunity cost, orient the reader to a particular, instrumentalist view of language as a resource, or more specifically, as a commodity that can be exchanged for value in a free market economy. The commodification of language and language speakers that appears within state language roadmaps is part of the broader social *Discourse* of neoliberalism which centers consumerism, choice and privatization. While many of the text examples above can be used to illustrate the reduction of language and language speakers to a fungible resource, the text below from the Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative (2007) is unambiguous in its positioning of multilingualism as an object or *product* to be used across multiple domains:

> [...] with regular input from the *end users* of the education system's *product*, educators can continuously improve foreign language education to fit current needs, including shifting resources to a newly identified high-need foreign language or occupational area (p. 8, *emphasis added*)

In arguing for more strategic communication between educators and the greater community, the Ohio Language Roadmap explicitly positions multilingual speakers as a functional *product* of the education system. The *end users* referenced in the text refer

back to the “demand-side of the world language equation” described earlier in the roadmap (p. 8). In this text, educators are called towards continuous improvement of their practice, a naturalized expectation for many professional fields, but in this case, improvement is predicated on a potential resource shift to a “newly identified high-need foreign language or occupational area”. The adjectival use of the past participle ‘identified’ obscures the actor of the identification. Based on the earlier emphasis on the ‘demand-side’, one can assume that it is not the educators or students themselves who will be identifying languages as ‘high-need’, but rather the ‘end users’ who will provide input on which languages are needed in business, government or community institutions.

In his discussion of the ways in which neoliberalism impacts public discourse, Harvey (2007) asks, “In whose particular interests is it that the state take a neoliberal stance and in what ways have those interests used neoliberalism to benefit themselves rather than, as is claimed, everyone, everywhere?” (p. 24). Part of the role of discourse analysis is to denaturalize patterns of language that can be perceived as common-sense. Public discourse surrounding education often rests on the sensibleness of expecting educators to prepare students for future employment, or to prepare students for additional educational opportunities that will lead to future employment. To suggest that educators shift practices in response to the needs of employers can therefore come across as common-sense. Positioning education as a pathway to employability, however, establishes a hierarchy of knowledge, skills and dispositions based on their utility and value in employment situations. While there may be some shared values between employers and the greater community, educating with equity in mind requires an

interrogation of any potential overlap. Educators and policymakers must question whose values are being served when shifts in practice are considered.

In addition to the commodification of language, the influence of neoliberalism can be seen throughout the roadmap documents in their unabashed promotion of free-market capitalism. The Rhode Island Roadmap, for example, describes how "MNCs [multinational corporations] also expressed the need for linguistic and cultural skills for *efficient transference of corporate values*, as well as for employees at all levels to work in global teams *around the clock*" (Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative, 2012, p.14, *emphasis added*). Here again we see the language-as-resource orientation, in this case language is named as a resource both for transferring a particular set of values as well as for facilitating increased work hours. The use of the phrase *corporate values* and the nominalization of 'transfer' to 'transference' creates ambiguity regarding what is being transferred to whom. While we can imagine what 'corporate values' might refer to, the directionality of their transfer is unclear. It could be that values are being transferred from management teams to workers, among workers themselves, or between service-oriented workers and the general public. The uncertainty embedded in this language obscures both the nature of and the audience for the values in question. The second half of the sentence, however, provides some insight into the indeterminate values in question. By suggesting that global teams work *around the clock*, it is clear that a key value for the multinational corporations described above is uninterrupted production. By using language as a resource to create the conditions for continual production, multinational corporations increase opportunities for competition and profit. The language of economics used within

state language roadmaps is buttressed with conceptual alignment to language commodification within the *Discourse* of neoliberalism. This convergence, however, does not exemplify the full range of ideological positions taken up within the language roadmaps. The following section highlights two divergent responses to the economic value of multilingualism.

Divergent Discourse on Valuing Language as an Economic Resource

While the roadmaps demonstrate ideological convergence around language as a resource with economic value, there are some salient points of divergence within the domain of economic value. This is consistent with the explanation of language policy given by Johnson (2015) who writes, "Language policy texts are not necessarily some homogeneous documentation of unitary authorial intentions but, instead, heteroglossic and often filled with diverse (even contradictory) ideas about language and/or language education" (p. 169). The following sections highlight two divergent discourses that emerged through discourse analysis in response to the commodification of language. The first discourse grants that the economic value of language warrants linguistic speculation through greater financial investments and incentives, while the second discourse acknowledges the value of language and uses that value to justify a view of language as a public good through expectations of generosity. Each of these positions are consequential for the distribution of benefits described in Chapter 4.

Encouraging 'Linguistic Speculation'

The first significant discourse that emerged in response to the economic language-as-resource orientation positions language as an advantageous investment. Brennan

(2018) describes this type of investment in language as linguistic speculation. Drawing on the larger social discourse of neoliberalism, language is positioned not just as a 'resource', but as a fungible economic commodity that can be used to advance agendas of competition across multiple levels. In economic terms, speculation is a type of investment that anticipates significant profit. By speculating on languages, businesses and other organizations are able to stake a claim in the value of languages. These claims are driven by hegemonic language ideologies that translate proficiency in particular languages into potential profit. Language speculation is present in the language roadmaps both directly through recommendations that suggest specific financial investments and incentives and indirectly through language that describes the general returns that can be anticipated through these investment strategies.

Given the economic value that is attributed to multilingualism through the commodification of language, it is unsurprising that language was positioned within some of the roadmaps as an explicitly fiduciary investment, one which should offer specific and measurable returns to society. The Oregon Language Roadmap weighed financial investment in language education against the return of 'functionally proficient speakers', an outcome-based approach to education that gained popularity after the 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as No Child Left Behind. Written in 2007, the Oregon Language Roadmap asserted that:

> Oregon annually spends approximately $80 million for K-16 foreign language education in order to produce fewer than 6,000 functionally proficient students. At a cost of $13,600 per proficient student, Oregonians are clearly not getting a good return on their investment. Doing more of the same is not a viable option (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 1).

By arguing that current language practices are a poor return on investment, the roadmap appeals to market theory to establish the need for improving current language education practices. This appeal was also reiterated in the discourse surrounding the roadmaps. In discussing university-level programming for world languages, one of the participants reflected on the costs involved in tertiary language education programming:

> The Flagship Program graduated, I mean, they *produced* 120 people in all the different languages. 120 people who had tested at superior level. And then one day, when I added up all the budget things that had been announced at the annual meetings, and that was, at that point $127 million, so it was like over a million dollars to *produce* a superior level student. That's the investment that went into it (Interview with Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative Participant, *emphasis added*).

While the scale of financial investment referred to in this interview excerpt is much more substantial, the scope of the claim converges on a similar appeal, namely that current speculation in language education is not *producing* the desired results. In response to this poor return, a multitude of recommendations were made within the language roadmaps to enhance pathways towards multilingualism. Two recommendations in particular, the use of language bonds and the use of financial incentives, demonstrate the consistent emphasis on linguistic speculation.

Language bonds are one of the more unique recommendations made by states in promoting and articulating pathways to multilingualism. Present only in the Oregon Language Roadmap (2007), the proposal for language education bonds consolidates the relationship between financial investments and measurable proficiency outcomes:

> Language education bonds will be financial instruments in the form of non-interest-bearing bonds tied to demonstrated proficiency. Returns will be linked to proficiency outcomes, allowing for market forces to work for improved levels of

> functionally proficient speakers (p. 9).

The poor return on investment described in the earlier text sets the stage for this type of explicit linguistic speculation. In the case of Oregon's language bonds, however, the potential for speculation was left unrealized. One of the participants described the political impracticability of the idea by saying:

> One of my favorite ideas was the language bonds. I don't know if you've read about that, but we're basically, you know, you give a bond, and if the school district meets, you know, a certain number of kids get to whatever proficiency level then that bond is forgiven sort of a thing. So, you know, something like that which is really cool. But, you know, really didn't stand a snowball's chance in hell of becoming political reality (Interview with Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

Despite discourse in and around the language roadmaps affirming the economic value of language education and multilingualism, the idiosyncrasy of the language education bond proposal precluded any political possibility of implementation. In contrast, fiduciary and non-fiduciary inducements were much more prevalent, and occurred in some form across all eight roadmaps. These inducements, framed as incentives or rewards for language education and multilingualism, were often applied broadly across multiple audiences, including businesses and schools as well as individual educators and students. As an example of the breadth of financial incentives structured into the roadmap documents, the Texas Language Roadmap (2007) includes:

- [S]alary premiums or other incentives (step increases, promotions, etc.) to employees with advanced language skills or to promote the development of that competency [...]
- Study and work abroad immersion experiences supported by scholarships from higher education and government grants or subsidized by companies with a need for language skills [...]

- [T]ax incentives for businesses who invest in programs that enhance the language proficiency of their employees [...]
- [T]he creation of a state-level Language Service Corps will provide an incentive for college students to integrate language study into their major and will reward graduates with advanced language proficiency (p. 19-20)

These financial inducements are an example of the type of linguistic speculation that is widespread throughout the language roadmaps. Offering financial incentives for the demonstration or development of linguistic skills continues to commodify language within a language-as-resource orientation. In describing the incentive structure of the Oregon Language Roadmap, one participant stated:

> So we thought that if we're going to gain any traction on this at all we really need to make this incentive-based to make it kind of a win-win for everyone, and when I mean everyone I mean, government, nonprofits, and business, small, medium and large enterprises (Interview with Oregon Language Roadmap Participant).

This discourse positions financial incentives as a 'win-win'. On the one hand, individual students or employees would presumably benefit from scholarships or salary increases, and on the other hand, businesses and other organizations would benefit through tax incentives and potential expansion of their client base. If the linguistic ideologies present in the roadmaps maintain that language has economic value, engaging in linguistic speculation through investments and incentives is one way to realize that value. Speculating on language, however, is not the only potential response to the commodification of language. The following section introduces a divergent set of expectations and recommendations surrounding how the value of language can be realized, namely through an expectation of generosity.

Expecting Linguistic Generosity

While one response to the perceived economic value of multilingualism is to encourage additional investment and speculation in language education, a secondary, divergent discourse also emerged in the roadmaps which positioned language as a resource which should be freely given and taken to meet greater societal needs. The idea that language is a gift that can and should be given by individuals to society aligns to a certain degree with the notion of 'helping professions' suggested by Gee (2011). According to Gee (2011), there is a widely circulating *Discourse* in society that certain professions are supposed to offer their knowledge and skills whenever needed. Although they are often compensated through traditional employment practices, these helping professions, including doctors and teachers, are expected to go above and beyond the parameters of their given employment should the need arise. In a similar vein, multilingual individuals are often expected to translate or interpret when needs arise in social and professional settings. The language skills of multilingual individuals are valued not only as commodities that can be exchanged for economic benefit, but as contributions that can and should be proffered for the well-being of society as a whole.

This expectation of generosity with language can be seen in the quote below from the Oregon Language Roadmap. The preceding section of the roadmap highlights recommendations for encouraging multilingualism for Oregonians who speak English at home, including opportunities for innovative language education programming and opportunities for studying abroad. The opportunities for Oregonians who speak English are contrasted in the text below with expectations for individuals who speak languages

other than English. The roadmap states:

> For those [Oregonians] who speak another language at home, building on and valuing their special linguistic abilities with programs to ensure literacy will allow them to become full-fledged members of American society while *contributing* their *special gift* to the country (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 3, *emphasis added*).

In this text, proficiency in a language beyond English is identified as a *special gift*. The use of the term 'gift' introduces lexical ambiguity into the text because the word 'gift' can be read multiple ways. First, a 'gift' can be something given without expectation of compensation. Under this interpretation, language skills are once again commodified, but their value is expected to be willingly exchanged for the benefit of the country. The term 'gift' can also be interpreted as a natural talent or ability. Even under this reading, however, the 'gift' of language is still expected to be contributed for social benefit. While there is lexical ambiguity in the authorial intentions behind the use of the word 'gift' in this text, I would argue that under both interpretations, the use of the term 'gift' in combination with the present participle *contributing* suggests an expectation of generosity with language. Whether language skills are viewed as a natural talent, or an uncompensated donation, speakers of languages beyond English are expected to contribute their language skills for the benefit of society.

In addition, this text also offers insight into what it means to be identified as a member of American society. Within the text, becoming a "full-fledged member of American society" is an allowance based on language and literacy skills. The text suggests that one of the ways to build on and value the 'special linguistic abilities' of Oregonians who speak languages beyond English is 'with programs to ensure literacy'.

The use of the verb 'allow' once again introduces lexical ambiguity into the text. A more restrictive reading could interpret the verb 'allow' as a type of sanctioning, while a less restrictive reading could see the allowance being referred to as opening spaces of opportunity. Whether allowance is interpreted as empowerment or authorization, this text positions literacy as essential to membership in American society. To be fully American, therefore, is to be able to read and write. Particular discourses about literacy have been naturalized in much the same way that particular ideologies of language have become hegemonic. It has become 'common-sense' to position literacy as necessary in American society, but the ways in which literacy is defined often reproduces monoglossic, Western-dominant ideologies about language standardization.

The expectations of generosity that accompany discourse about language and multilingualism also create opportunities for linguistic exploitation. If language is imagined as a public good which should be used to benefit society, we also need to consider how any potential benefits are distributed across society. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) draws specific attention to how the linguistic skills of heritage language skills are used or misused in society:

> Developing advanced language skills also means *taking advantage of* the linguistic abilities already obtained by heritage speakers who are often considered "disadvantaged" learners. As one working group member noted, "Why suppress a heritage language in the early years and then ask the student to study it as a 'foreign' language in high school?" (p. 17).

The text above acknowledges that heritage speakers are frequently positioned as 'disadvantaged', a deficit-based orientation that is reminiscent of Ruiz's (1984) language-as-problem orientation. The pathologization of heritage language speakers is well-

documented in research, and the use of quotes around 'disadvantaged' in the original text indicates authorial awareness of this label as well as potential disagreement. Instead of problematizing the linguistic repertoires of heritage language speakers, the Texas roadmap creates an opportunity for heritage language skills to be *taken advantage of*, although by whom and for what purpose is left ambiguous.

Implications for Language Policy

In his description of discourse analysis, Gee (2005) asks us to consider "How consistent are the relevant Discourse models here? Are there competing or conflicting Discourse models at play? Whose interests are the Discourse models representing?" (p. 93). The examples above have highlighted consistency across the language roadmaps in approaching language education and multilingualism through the *Discourse* of neoliberalism. The roadmaps also introduced competing discourses that simultaneously encourage linguistic speculation and investment in language while also expecting a certain degree of linguistic generosity. To understand the implications of these conflicting discourse examples, it is important to understand whose interests are being represented in each model and who benefits from the particular ideologies present in the roadmaps.

Implications of Linguistic Speculation

One of the first interests that must be interrogated is who benefits when beliefs in language as an economic resource compel states towards linguistic speculation. While some types of linguistic speculation discussed in the roadmaps were never realized, such as the language education bonds proposed by Oregon, discourse around language investment as a 'win-win' suggests that when language investment is realized, the

benefits are distributed equally across multiple domains. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that bilingual skills result in higher wages for workers (e.g. Subtirelu, 2017), so within the workplace, the benefits of bilingualism do not seem to accrue directly to individuals. Institutions, on the other hand, are able to expand their potential client base, which for businesses, can result in additional profit. The benefits of language speculation are therefore skewed towards institutions and not individual language speakers.

In drafting language policy, state leaders need to consider how the benefits of financial speculation may disproportionately impact individuals and institutions. In addition, policymakers must attend to the ways in which well-intentioned incentives reify language commodification and linguistic hegemony. Providing financial compensation for language skills fixes not just general, but specific economic value to language. Based on the differential status of different languages in different contexts, any potential compensation could be expected to be dissimilar as well. The use of different languages for different purposes is highlighted in two interview excerpts below:

> So almost nobody in Columbus is doing business with Somalia. But we definitely need Somali speakers (Interview with Ohio Language Roadmap Participant).

> [T]he desire to maintain and strengthen the Hawaiian language [is] an area which is of absolutely no interest to the Bank of Hawai‘i. They don't have any, they don't have any need for the Hawaiian language to improve their bottom line (Interview with Hawai‘i Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

In both of these examples, the status of language use within business enterprises is drawn to the fore. For Ohio, which has a significant population of Somali speakers, the use of Somali for business purposes is not a motivating factor towards multilingualism because of the limited business relationship between Ohio and Somali. Somali speakers are still

recognized as a ‘need’ within the community, however, with allusion to the material and discursive benefits of multilingualism beyond the economic domain. In Hawai‘i, the need for language in relation to the ‘bottom line’ excludes indigenous languages like Hawaiian, while potentially creating space for languages that could have stronger commercial and economic appeal.

In summarizing how the privileging of language for economic purposes can lead to inequalities, another participant offered the following advice:

> The diversity of languages is really important, that we're not just privileging, you know, Chinese and Spanish but that we make sure that we are offering students different options for languages to study, and elevating, you know, the status of languages so that, then also continuation you know, that we don't have the unintended consequence by way of having dual language immersion for only a couple of languages, meaning that then the other languages are no longer considered worthy of support, or being funded (Interview with Utah Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

When the economic value attached to language compels policy makers towards linguistic speculation, the unintended consequence may be the continual reproduction of hegemonic language hierarchies that reify language as a fungible resource to be invested in not because of the intrinsic value of language, but because of specific and measurable economic objectives and benefits.

Implications of Linguistic Generosity

The second interest that must be interrogated is who benefits when the economic value of language is framed as a public good to be gifted or exploited for social benefits. The expectation that multilingual individuals enact the full range of their linguistic repertoires whenever needed is problematic for a number of reasons. While some may see

language as a public good that can and should be used for the benefit of society, this orientation towards language raises questions about whose language skills are considered part of the public domain and in what circumstances. Expectations of generosity with language might look different in a healthcare setting than in a corporate boardroom, and those differences can provide insight into how language status complicates the perceived economic value and use of language. Expectations of language generosity also need to be weighed against raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) to determine how those expectations might be positioned in relation to racialized individuals. If language speakers are subject to a different set of expectations based on perceived racial backgrounds, the benefits of an orientation towards generosity are once again inequitably distributed across society. An unintended consequence of language policy built on expectations of linguistic generosity is the reinforcement of hegemonic power structures.

Although this chapter has focused on the distinct responses that emerged from orientations of language as a resource with economic value, framing language policy options as either linguistic speculation or linguistic generosity would be a false dichotomy that reinforces binary reasoning in Western-dominant thought. Instead of pushing policymakers towards one or the other, I recommend that policymakers instead cultivate an awareness of how these two conflicting discourses show up in their work so that they can anticipate the unintended consequences of these ideologies in action and work towards more equitable distribution of the economic benefits that are afforded to individuals and institutions because of language proficiency.

While the discursive elements of neoliberalism and linguistic commodification are present across all eight roadmaps included in this study, it is worth noting that some of the most prominent examples of this discourse appear in the earlier roadmaps. In the earlier section on linguistic speculation, the preponderance of examples are drawn from the states of Oregon, Ohio and Texas, which represent the first cohort of language roadmap initiatives completed in 2007. The visibility of linguistic speculation in particular, and the discourse of economics more broadly are likely tied in part to the guidance provided by the National Security Education Program. Evolving public discourse on language education and multilingualism can be seen in discursive shifts towards issues of equity and social justice which will be taken up in Chapter 6.

Conclusion

This chapter used discourse analysis to examine points of ideological convergence and divergence in the language of economics within state language roadmaps. I provided examples of how language is positioned as a resource with economic value through the use of lexical items like competition, supply and demand, and opportunity cost. These examples underscored the ways in which language and language speakers are commodified through the broader social *Discourse* of neoliberalism. As a consequence of the ideological positioning of language as an economic resource, two divergent discursive responses emerged within the roadmaps: an encouragement of linguistic speculation and an expectation of linguistic generosity. The following chapter continues a critical exploration of language policy by addressing the presence and absence of equity within

the broader sociopolitical contexts in which the language roadmaps documents were written.

Chapter 6: Centering Equity in Language Education Policy

The preceding chapters sought to identify ideologies and orientations toward language by examining specific examples of discourse in and around state language roadmap initiatives. This chapter focuses on the intersections between language and social justice by exploring the presence and absence of equity throughout the language roadmaps. Beliefs about power, privilege and access necessarily inform the design and implementation of language education policy. Analyzing the ways in which the roadmaps attend to issues of equity can provide insight into how affordances of proposed policies might be distributed across society. The decision to devote a chapter to equity is a reflection not only of my own developing understanding of how our nation, and specifically our classrooms, are impacted by issues of equity, but also because of the highly visible, public conversations about equity and social justice that surfaced through the interview process and continue to unfold across multiple domains in our world today.

Public discourse related to equity continues to evolve, which raises challenges not only for the analysis of discourse, but also for the articulation of findings. Some may argue that it is unfair to critique the language used over a decade ago when the first language roadmaps were written, but my hope is that a robust discussion will offer opportunities to explore how attention to equity has shifted over time and chart a path forward that embraces continuing dialogue on the issues of equity and social justice. I fully acknowledge that the presence or absence of equity in the language roadmaps would likely look much different today than it did when the roadmaps were written. This recognition has been confirmed by multiple interview participants who cited a focus on

equity as a significant distinction in imagined, future roadmap initiatives. The discussion I offer on this topic is not meant to denounce or disparage previous state roadmap initiatives, because I recognize that my own work from the last decade would be correspondingly outdated by present-day dialogue on issues of equity.

The following sections address the relationship between language and equity, beginning with an overview of current issues that inform my positionality on the topic, and continuing into an analysis of social justice discourse within the language roadmaps. The analysis included in this chapter draws attention to the ways in which language roadmap initiatives frame the need for language education, the hegemony of particular language practices within our schools, and the distribution of benefits related to language education. This chapter also includes connections to raciolinguistic ideologies, and a discussion on how equity can be centered in language education policy moving forward. My hope is that this chapter contributes opportunities for reflection and reconstruction in the articulation of language policy proposals while maintaining appreciation for the multiple stakeholder perspectives that continue to advance conversations about multilingualism and language education in our world today.

Current Issues in Equity

In writing this chapter, I believe a brief discussion of current events is necessary to situate my positionality as a researcher and to potentially inform a deeper understanding of the interview responses. As discussed in Chapter 3, participant responses during the interview are best viewed as a type of co-constructed dialogue rather than as a detached and empirical set of data. The dialogue excerpts used throughout this

chapter, as well as in the preceding chapters, represent parts of a larger conversation, both with me as a researcher, and with society writ large. While a comprehensive overview of current issues is beyond the scope of this chapter, I will attempt to overview some of the most salient equity concerns that have captured the attention of the nation, including political rhetoric on the topic of equity, police brutality against communities of color, and ongoing racial disparities in education and healthcare.

The previous year has seen a great deal of political turmoil with the 2020 presidential campaign that saw the proliferation of racialized rhetoric across social media and dramatic shifts in state-sanctioned discourse related to racial equity. Towards the end of his term in 2020, former President Trump issued an "*Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping*" that railed against "divisive concepts" and effectively banned any government-sponsored trainings that might include discussions of critical race theory or white privilege. After the election, Trump's order was countermanded by newly elected President Biden in his "*Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government*" which was issued on his first day in office. Biden's executive order calls out "entrenched disparities" and asserts the role of the federal government in "advancing equity for all, including people of color and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent poverty and inequality" (p.1). Protests at the capitol in the wake of the election further underscored racial inequities as the largely white pro-Trump crowd was able to infiltrate the capitol building with limited police engagement. When compared with the heavily armed security forces that attended earlier Black Lives Matter

rallies, the limited police response to the violent insurrection provided additional evidence of the racial bias in law enforcement.

After decades of protests against police brutality, the past year saw the nation once again embroiled in unrest after George Floyd, a black man in Minneapolis, was killed by police following an incident at a local convenience store. In the weeks and months following Floyd's death, protesters took to the streets in Minnesota and in many other states to call for the prosecution of the officers involved and to raise awareness of countless other incidents of police brutality against communities of color. This was not the first time that Minnesota has captured the attention of the nation with regards to police brutality. Four years earlier, the shooting of Philando Castile was also recorded on video and widely shared via social media. The acquittal of the officer involved in Castile's death reinforced widespread beliefs in the lack of accountability for police officers who use deadly force. While the trials for officers involved in Floyd's death are still underway, the collective impact of repeated incidents of violence against people of color at the hands of law enforcement are a stark reminder of material consequences that racial biases perpetuate on an ongoing basis.

Racial disparities have also garnered additional attention in the areas of education and healthcare. Federal law requires the disaggregation of school accountability data by a number of different factors, including race and socioeconomic status. The accountability data required by the federal government includes student achievement and growth on standardized tests as well as graduation rates and school climate indicators. Minnesota is frequently identified as one of the states with the most severe disproportionalities

between student groups based on race. As schools wrestle with shifting program models as a result of health precautions, the disparities between student groups continues to be highlighted. Inequitable access to healthcare for communities of color has also become more visible as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. After more than a year of state restrictions to curb the spread of the coronavirus, statistics clearly demonstrate that communities of color are more likely to suffer fatalities as a result of COVID-19, and that access to the vaccine is disproportionately low for communities of color. Together, these disparities contribute to the cumulative distress of marginalized communities and bolster public calls for more critical analysis and transformation of current social systems.

In discussing the present-day predominance of conversations around equity, I want to be careful not to suggest that dialogue on equity and social justice are in any way a new phenomenon. There have always been advocates and communities that have advanced conversations about social justice regardless of the sociopolitical climate. The realities of injustice are not new to the marginalized communities that have endured centuries of oppression and continue to fight for basic human rights, including the right to language. This discussion of current events is meant only to highlight my positionality and situate my work within a specific sociopolitical moment. As events continue to unfold, I recognize that my work and my writing may take on different interpretations and I hope that evolution supports continuing conversations on issues of equity. In the sections that follow, I use the tools of discourse analysis to unpack the historical presence and absence of equity in language roadmap initiatives, beginning with how the need for language education has been framed and historicized across multiple states.

Framing and Historicizing Language Education

Before addressing the ways in which language education is framed and historicized through the roadmaps, it is important to acknowledge once again that the roadmaps were written over a span of more than ten years, and that public discourse around equity and language education has shifted significantly over that time. As the most recently written roadmaps, Wisconsin and Indiana both have a much stronger focus on equity than the earlier roadmaps, as illustrated in the examples throughout this chapter. While the trajectory of the discourse in the language roadmaps seems to be moving towards more inclusive language and practices, equity is not a destination to be arrived at once and for all, but rather a continuum and pathway of practices that does not always progress in a linear fashion. My hope is that this discussion represents a step forward for marginalized language communities seeking linguistic justice in educational spaces.

The task of discourse analysis is a complex one, especially when exploring a multifaceted topic such as equity. In addition to examining the extant language, researchers can also explore what is not said in the text. Discourse analysis is built around asking questions, not just about the text itself, but also what is absent from the text, and what alternative ways the text could have been written (Gee, 2005). By examining what is present, what is absent, and what alternatives exist, discourse analysts are able to create hypotheses about what a specific piece of language is doing. In the case of the roadmaps, the overarching function is to promote multilingualism. While there are many strategies suggested throughout the roadmaps, one recommendation offered across all of the

roadmaps is expanded language education. The coalescence around expanded language education is significant because it provides evidence of the figured problems being addressed by the roadmaps. Arguing for extended sequencing and greater access to language education concurrently suggests that existing pathways and programming are insufficient. If the status quo is lacking, the subsequent question to ask of the text is, "Why is it that current language education pathways need to be expanded?"

The roadmaps offer several responses to this question, but their framing of the problem is largely centered around current geopolitical affairs and lacks the historicization necessary to fully address issues of equity. In the example below from the Wisconsin Language Roadmap, the need for learning languages, including English, is situated within a discussion of past, present and future. The historical summary of linguistic diversity that precedes this excerpt highlights the languages of indigenous and immigrant communities in Wisconsin and described the sustained and autonomous use of these languages throughout prior moments in history. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap (2018) goes on to say:

> By contrast, today's communities are more interconnected through globalization, and goods and services are imported and exported in ways and at rates that would have been unimaginable in the 19th and early 20th centuries. This increased interdependence has made learning English a necessity for more recent immigrants to the United States. At the same time, it has made the ability to communicate effectively in languages other than English essential for successfully competing in global markets (p. 9).

This text suggests that the need for multilingualism, and as a corollary, increased opportunities for language education, is based on increasing globalization and interdependence. While it may be true that transnationalism is intensifying, what is

missing from this explanation are the historical precedents that devalued and diminished the sustainability and autonomy of languages other than English. While the roadmap calls for attention to indigenous language revitalization, it does not mention the systematic linguicide that led to the current need for indigenous language education. While it describes the richness of immigrant languages, it does not describe the linguistic discrimination and English-only educational practices that these communities faced in earlier generations. To suggest that more language education is needed in schools without discussing the role of schools in attempting to eradicate other languages misses a key historical explanation for why English monolingualism continues to predominate not only in the state of Wisconsin, but across the United States.

The increased interdependence referenced in the excerpt, while accurate, does not address the linguistic imperialism and colonialism that has shaped our language landscape. Tollefson (2015) writes that "In the United States and Canada, language policies can only be understood within the context of the historical conquest of the continent by European settlers and the associated effort to eradicate Native American languages" (p. 141). In order to understand and implement the types of policies recommended across all the roadmaps, serious attention must be paid to the history of language education within our country.

Some roadmap participants did discuss the realities of linguistic inequities. A participant from Hawai'i reported that "In Hawai'i, there's tremendous awareness of linguistic injustice and violence against languages other than mainstream English" (Interview with Hawai'i Language Roadmap Initiative Participant). While some may

argue that the roadmaps themselves were not meant to address these past and present injustices, I would argue that by not addressing them in the text of the roadmaps, the goals and recommendations lean towards benefiting communities that have not experienced linguistic violence. McGroarty (2012) draws attention to the "collective memory of language repression and persecution" that lives on within many communities (p. 95). Without addressing this collective memory and working to repair the harm, the distribution of benefits related to language education will continue to be unequal. The following section addresses this unequal distribution in greater detail.

Distribution of Language Education Benefits

The distribution of benefits across society is a principal concern of equity. As described in Chapter 4, there are myriad benefits ascribed to multilingualism and language education, but the allocation of those advantages is not always clear. Some discourse in and around the roadmaps situates the benefits at the institutional level, for businesses, government agencies and nation-states, while other narratives described the individual benefits related to relationships and academic achievement. In addition to this distinction between institutional and individual benefits, an analysis of equity also warrants consideration of how the benefits of multilingualism and language education are distributed across different groups based on factors such as language background, race, or socioeconomic status. One participant described the inequitable language education opportunities available to students by saying:

> You know, one of the things I've always thought was so utterly bizarre and contradictory was that we tell, we tell the white high school students from wealthy families, go abroad and study and learn a foreign language, but we tell immigrant

> kids here, 'Don't speak your native language; speak only English', right? What? That is so contradictory to me, right? That creates this kind of disproportionality in education outcomes for those kids really early on, it kind of embeds it in them (Interview with Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

This quote highlights the different beliefs and ideologies that function to exclude certain students from equitable access to language development. When language education is supported for one group of students (i.e. 'white' and 'wealthy') while systematically discouraged for students from 'immigrant' families, it becomes clear that the supposed benefits of multilingualism are not distributed equitably. The intersection of race and language, which is discussed in more detail in a subsequent section, impacts access to effective language education. One participant described a lack of knowledge around how "black and African American students are diverted away, say from language programs" (Interview with Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative Participant). The realities of inequitable access to language education occasioned the following call to action within the Wisconsin Language Roadmap (2018), which recommends:

> Providing equity in access to the benefits of language learning by individual and demographic subgroups of students through policies and practices that include analysis of participation rates and removal of obstacles limiting access. These obstacles may include scheduling, advising, and biases (p. 25),

This quote recognizes that institutional scheduling practices and individual beliefs and biases may play a role in inequitable participation rates in language education programming based on factors like race or language background. Intentional analysis and discussion of participation rates is the first step in being able to respond to and redress issues of access. Confronting entrenched biases and beliefs about language education is

not an easy task, as evidenced by the ongoing hegemony of English, even within language education spaces.

Hegemony of English in Language Education

The status of the English language has been naturalized around the world through years of imperialism and colonialism. Although English is not an official language of the United States at the federal level, it has been made an official language by multiple state governments. Of the eight states discussed in this paper, five have no official language (Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin), two have designated English as the sole official state language (Utah and Indiana), and Hawai‘i has named both English and Hawaiian as official state languages. Even within the states that have not named English as an official language, the status of English remains privileged, and its use is positioned as unquestionable. Oregon describes the significance of English by saying:

> It goes without saying that every Oregonian must have a professional level of English to participate fully in the economic and social life of the state (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 3)

Within this excerpt, English is made significant through the use of the modal auxiliary ‘must’, the use of the adverb ‘fully’ to modify participation in the life of the state, and the clause ‘it goes without saying’ used to preface proficiency in English. I do not want to argue that English is not significant within the United States, but rather that the continued narrative emphasis on English as a gateway to full participation and economic success is incomplete because of the way it ignores the realities of raciolinguistic ideologies and reproduces a monoglossic vision of language. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) also naturalizes the hegemony of English by stating:

> A well-known, bilingual public figure should serve as spokesperson for the campaign making it clear that, yes, everyone should learn English – and they should learn another language as well! (p. 14)

Chapter 4 discussed the prevalence of strategies to campaign for public awareness. This quote from Texas highlights one strategy of engaging a popular, bilingual public figure as a spokesperson. The messaging being delivered first and foremost, however, is one that reinforces the dominance of English. The interjection 'yes' affirms that English proficiency is a given and primary goal, and the use of the adverbial phrase 'as well' serves to position learning languages beyond English as secondary and subsequent objective. Even in a policy document designed to promote multilingualism, the preeminence of English takes center stage. The hegemony of English was also recognized by interview participants, as evidenced in the following quote:

> We need to be like Europe, I mean, people speak all kinds of languages in Europe, because the borders are so close. I mean, English only shit has to stop at some point. But it keeps coming and going, coming and going, coming and going (Interview with Utah Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

The recurrent and iterative nature of beliefs about English are emphasized in the quote above through repetition of the phrase 'coming and going'. In earlier chapters, I wrote that language is inherently political because it relates to the distribution of social goods within society. Attempting to shift beliefs about language is a political change, and political change is rarely linear, especially when ideologies are deeply rooted. When articulating a vision for multilingualism, I believe it is important not only to question the realities of named languages and monoglossic ideologies, but also to critically examine the de jure and de facto role of English within society. Critical attention to the emphasis

on English supports a deeper discussion of how multilingualism and language education are defined and understood. The language roadmap initiatives, in spite of their similarities, each approach issues of language from unique sociocultural and historical contexts. This diversity can be seen in the way that the roadmaps attend to issues of equity related to heritage and indigenous languages, signed languages and to the intersections of race and language, each of which are addressed in succession.

Locating Equity in Language Roadmaps

Differential access to identities, activities, institutions and the social goods they offer is causally related to inequities within our world. Because access to social goods is mediated through language, the study of language is fully implicated with issues of equity (Gee, 2005). Given this entanglement, the following sections seek to locate equity within the roadmaps through the topics of heritage languages, indigenous languages, signed languages and race. Together, these topics demonstrate the diversity of policy presences and absences across the different roadmap initiatives.

Heritage Languages

All of the roadmaps mention heritage languages, or heritage speakers with the exception of Utah which refers to "native world language speaking residents" (Utah Language Roadmap Initiative, 2009, p. 15). The term 'heritage' is one with significant variation in usage across contexts, including historical evolutions. Some roadmaps include references to both heritage and native speakers, with little description of how these two groups are differentiated from one another. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap

(2018) defines heritage languages as any languages "other than the dominant one(s) in society" (p. 25). It goes on to say that:

> In the United States, heritage languages refer to languages other than English that may be spoken at home and/or in local communities. Heritage language students possess a range of oral language and literacy skills in their heritage language. (Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative, 2018, p. 25)

In the Wisconsin definition, heritage language is not tied to any particular proficiency level. This contrasts with the phraseology in the Oregon Language Roadmap, which states that "Heritage speakers are an asset because they have *mastered* another language and culture" (Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 2, *emphasis added*). Both roadmaps highlight the value of heritage languages through an assets-based orientation. Strategies for supporting heritage language speakers include greater access to educational opportunities, career development resources, and incentives for continuing language development and practice. The roadmaps recognize some of the challenges related to fully supporting heritage speakers, especially with relation to beliefs about language.

The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) calls out a gap in understanding within local school districts by recognizing the 'natural advantage' heritage speakers have in becoming bilingual, but also stating that, "[V]ery few school districts see *informal* knowledge of heritage languages as a building block for additional, *formal* language acquisition" (p. 8). Even while positioning heritage language as an asset or advantage, the use of the adjectives 'formal' and 'informal' reproduce an inequitable distinction between language knowledge learned through the home and through the school. This distinction is not applied to English, but to languages other than English named explicitly in the text.

The naming and positioning of languages within the roadmap highlights opportunities for more equitable descriptions of heritage languages that legitimates multiple forms of language learning and acquisition.

Indigenous Languages

When considering the issue of equity in relation to language, the topic of indigenous languages is a salient concern. Within the United States, hundreds of indigenous languages have been systematically eradicated through assimilationist education policies. With the exception of the Wisconsin and Hawai‘i roadmaps, references to indigenous languages within the roadmaps are limited or nonexistent. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap is the only roadmap that uses the term ‘indigenous’ with regard to the languages spoken throughout the continent before settler colonialism. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap (2018) states:

> In 2018, the learning and teaching of indigenous languages thus take on significant urgency with unique challenges. One such challenge is increasing the number of proficient second-language speakers of indigenous languages who also possess both the commitment and education credentials to teach these languages to the youngest generation and thus prevent language extinction (p. 8).

Without explicit reference to the historical linguicide, the challenge of teaching and learning indigenous languages is situated in the lack of committed and credentialed teachers. While it may be true that the number of licensed indigenous teachers is disproportionate to the need, portraying the challenge exclusively through this narrative is incomplete. A more complete picture would explicate the role that schools have historically played in displacing indigenous language and knowledge from formal educational spaces. In redressing this historical transgression, the language roadmaps of

Wisconsin and Hawai‘i discuss innovative programming that is being implemented to advance indigenous language education. While the Hawai‘i Language Roadmap does not explicitly use the term ‘indigenous’, it does include myriad references to the indigenous language of Hawaiian, and the strategies used to advance Hawaiian language development:

> The State of Hawai‘i and numerous communities throughout the state have invested significantly in the development of Hawaiian language talent, most especially through the funding of Hawaiian language immersion schools (Hawai‘i Language Roadmap Initiative, 2013, p. 8).

A few other roadmaps make limited references to indigenous languages and communities using other terminology. The Texas Language roadmap cites ‘Native Americans’ within its description of state demographics, and the Indiana Language Roadmap lists ‘Native American’ languages as part of the linguistic diversity of the state. The roadmaps from Ohio, Oregon, Utah and Rhode Island make no mention of indigenous or Native American languages. The limited references to indigenous languages throughout many of the roadmaps are a missed opportunity to expand understanding of multilingualism and extend additional language education opportunities to indigenous communities.

While not official policy documents, the language roadmaps do provide recommendations that serve to inform policymakers and educational leaders about next steps in language education. Future roadmap documents could create space to historicize the relationship between indigenous communities and past language education practices, and to chart a path forward that repairs and redresses collective harm with state support for community-driven language programming.

Signed Languages

Another lacuna within the roadmaps relates to signed languages. American Sign Language is listed as an example of the diversity of languages taught only within certain states. The Texas Language Roadmap cites Spanish as the most studied language within the state and goes on to say that **"**Rounding out the top five languages taught within the state are French, German, Latin, and American Sign Language" (Texas Language Roadmap Initiative, 2007, p. 6). The Indiana Language Roadmap (2019) references signed language in its recommendation to:

> Diversify the languages offered and strengthen the quality of K-16 curricular language learning choices, including less commonly taught languages, heritage languages, American Sign Language, and Native American languages (p. 14).

Apart from these scant references, the only other section of roadmap text that calls attention to signed languages is in the glossary of the Wisconsin Language Roadmap (2018), which defines 'world languages' as: "A term used to refer to all human languages, spoken and *signed*, other than English" (p. 26, *emphasis added*). Advancing equity requires attending to language communities that have been marginalized through current systems and structures, and signed languages communities continue to face challenges with language access and status. More direct attention to signed languages in state language roadmaps would support broader, multimodal conceptualizations of multilingualism and support greater accessibility.

Race and Language

In Chapter 2, I briefly discussed intersections between race and language, especially those based on raciolinguistic ideologies. In summary, raciolinguistics

examines how race and language are co-constitutive and raciolinguistic ideologies inform perceptions of language produced by marginalized racial groups. While the specific theorization of raciolinguistics is relatively new, considerations of race in language studies have been an important part of the field for much longer. Despite the compelling connections between race and language, mentions of race are largely absent from the roadmaps. The Texas Language Roadmap (2007) includes a brief mention of several racial and ethnic groups in a discussion of state demographics, as seen in this excerpt:

> Groups that have traditionally been minorities in Texas such as Hispanics, African Americans, and Asian Americans are now in the majority; over half the population of the state is non-white (p. 1).

In addition, race is also mentioned parenthetically in the Wisconsin Language Roadmap as a potential obstacle that could "adversely impact students' ability to access language education". The full quote, reproduced below, demonstrates an awareness of the need to review and revise institutional policies that perpetuate systemic racism, but falls short of fully explicating why race is presented as an obstacle.

> Educational institutions whose policies and practices support all students in benefiting from world language education do so by integrating additional resources, implementing and revising policies, and ameliorating potential obstacles that can adversely impact students' ability to access language education (e.g., poverty, *race*, region, limited technology, etc.) (Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative, 2018, p. 25, *emphasis added*)

As race is not something that can be ameliorated, the use of the term 'racism' may have offered a clearer illustration and supported a discursive shift from racial equity to anti-racism. Beyond the two references to race given above from the Texas and Wisconsin roadmaps, there are no other textual citations of race in the other roadmaps. Given the

inherent interrelations between race and language, I agree with Flores and Chaparro (2017) who write that "Until these [racial and economic] inequalities are addressed, language education policy will not be able to equitably meet the needs of these vastly different communities" (p. 378). The final section of this chapter aims to chart a course towards greater equity by highlighting some of the explicit, equity-focused recommendations from roadmap participants.

Charting a Course Towards Greater Equity

As part of the interview process, I asked roadmap participants to imagine how the roadmaps might look different if they were drafted today. One of the most frequent responses throughout the interviews was that future roadmap endeavors would have a much greater emphasis on equity and social justice. I began this chapter by summarizing some of the current events that are (re)shaping community understandings of equity. This community dialogue, and evolving cognizance of equity within the field of language education can be seen in the interview comments that follow. In the first example, there is a straightforward recognition of how the historical context shaped the roadmaps:

> You know, the interesting part is, it was a very, obviously the period of time where most of these roadmaps were convened and the process started was a very different environment than now. If you're building roadmaps now, it would be around social justice. It wouldn't be around the politics of why language is important in business and why language is important for education, it would be more built around how we integrate schools, how we address inequality (Interview with Participant across Multiple Language Roadmap Initiatives).

As discussed in Chapter 1, the business emphasis throughout the roadmaps was driven in part by the official aims of the initiative, which can be seen in the Request for Proposals from the Language Flagship. In an effort to shape the project deliverable with a similar

bearing as that of the initiative funders, many of the roadmaps aligned their discourse with the language of business and economics. While involving stakeholders from the business community certainly lends a perspective to language education that has not always been part of a comprehensive pathway articulation, the profit-orientation of local businesses does not always align with the goals of social justice and equity. This lack of alignment can be seen in the quote below where another roadmap participant shares a vision for future roadmaps:

> I think that it [the language roadmap] would have a more equity, social justice kind of a focus to it and be more about, like, building on the strengths of our community, and less business driven. Because I think that's helped us, in some ways, but it also hasn't helped us in other ways (Interview with Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

While multiple participants recommended shifting away from an emphasis on business, there was also a recognition that the business focus did offer benefits to the roadmap initiatives. Focusing on business involvement in the roadmap process provided the kind of cross-sector perspectives and insights that language education professors are not always privy to access. The opportunities for collaboration and conversation with local businesses is not something that should be forestalled, but rather incorporated in conjunction with a greater focus on equity. This nuance can be difficult, especially when multiple audiences are involved. The degree to which equity is centered in language education policy is an issue that was addressed by another roadmap participant:

> I think that we would make the issue of equity front and center. I think we kind of assumed it would it would sort of, not take care of itself, but by making it statewide, and in so many districts, that it would be an equitable program, but I think the issue of equity, and where to put what kind of schools, and how to be really intentional about placing DLI [Dual Language Immersion] in certain

> neighborhoods and not necessarily, you know the language that we would always say that should be the language, but being really intentional about equity issues (Interview with Utah Language Roadmap Initiative Participant).

The quote above highlights that work around equity does need to be intentional. Systems are designed to reproduce themselves, and our current inequitable education systems will continue to marginalize linguistically diverse students and families unless affirmative steps are taken to design and implement language education policy that is centered on social justice. As one of the most recent roadmaps, the Wisconsin Language Roadmap does attend to the issue of equity in more explicit ways than previous roadmaps. One of the goals within the Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative (2018) is to "Ensure equity in and access to participation in language and global learning for all students and promote personalized learning and student agency in language learning" (p. iii). The goals of equity, access and agency are central to disrupting the current status quo and reimagining pathways towards multilingualism in all communities.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to locate equity within published state language roadmaps while also locating the roadmaps themselves in an evolving public discourse on equity. I began by sharing some current events that continue to co-construct a public dialogue through political rhetoric and through the realities of racial disparities across law enforcement, education and healthcare. While the roadmaps do demonstrate increasing awareness of issues of equity, convergent discourse across the roadmaps that calls for increased language consciousness is undermined by policy silences. Public awareness and investment in language education cannot be fully addressed without reference to past

and present language policies that have continued to reproduce hegemonic language ideologies. Within this chapter, I provided examples of how the need for language education is framed and historicized, how the benefits of multilingualism are distributed, and how the de facto status of English continues to dominate even in spaces designed to promote multilingualism. I identified the presence and absence of discussions related to heritage, indigenous, and signed languages as well as examining the intersections between race and language. Like many of the roadmap participants I interviewed, I believe future roadmaps have an opportunity and obligation to center equity in much more explicit ways. In alignment with Valdez et al. (2016), I urge those designing and implementing language policy to prioritize equity for marginalized students and families. The final chapter provides a brief summary of the findings from the preceding chapters and offers potential directions for future research related to state language roadmaps and implications for future articulations of language education policy.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

This study of state language roadmaps was occasioned by my own observations of the official and unofficial ways state policies actors across the country have taken up affirmative rhetoric on multilingualism and the fact that despite this encouraging discourse on the benefits of bilingualism, multilingual learners in U.S. schools continue to face ongoing marginalization. State language roadmaps position multilingualism as a benefit to society, but to-date, few research studies have been published on how particular language ideologies emerge from the messaging in these state policy documents. The discursive analysis conducted in this study was designed to understand in more detail what language ideologies are reproduced through state language roadmaps. In this final chapter, I synthesize the key elements of my study, including the literature, methodology and findings presented in previous chapters. I discuss potential implications of this research for policymakers and practitioners in language education and conclude by proposing additional areas of future study and research.

Summary of Literature

The theoretical framing for this study draws on scholarship from the field of applied linguistics, including a focus on language policy and planning and language ideologies. A detailed examination of the domains within LPP illustrated how state actions and policies have played a significant role in legitimizing and standardizing certain language varieties through ideologically driven language policies (Ricento, 2000). This standardization is especially pronounced in the hegemony of English and the predominance of monoglossic ideologies within U.S. schools. Countering colonial

language practices requires careful consideration of languaging as a dynamic and multi-layered practice that can be studied explicitly and critically through discourse analysis. In Chapter 2, I introduced the social theory of neoliberalism as an analytical frame to examine how language has been commodified (Flores & García, 2017) and how discourses of bilingualism have been co-opted as a market benefit (Poza, 2017). My engagement with scholarship on language policy and planning, language ideologies and discourse analysis established the arena in which I have situated my study.

Summary of Methods

To investigate the discursive reproduction of particular language ideologies in informal policy documents known as state language roadmaps, I chose to conduct a qualitative policy discourse analysis around the following research questions:

A. What language ideologies exist in the text of language roadmaps?

B. What discourses exist surrounding the language roadmaps and their development?

C. How are these discourses and language ideologies evident in policy proposals?

In addition to the texts of eight state language roadmaps, I also conducted interviews with 24 key informants involved in each state roadmap initiative and reviewed ancillary documents related to state language roadmaps. All of these texts were examined using the tools and strategies discourse analysis introduced by Gee (2005, 2011).

Summary of Findings

As informal policy documents, state language roadmaps include many opportunities for investigation and analysis. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, I presented a set of findings based on a discursive analysis of the texts, including coeval artifacts and

interview transcripts. All of these texts were reviewed as part of a dynamic policy assemblage. Like many policy documents, the discourses that circulate throughout these texts collude and compete with one another, ultimately shaping diverse recommendations for practice. Ancillary texts and contemporary conversations about the roadmaps also supported and subverted particular language ideologies. Creese and Blackledge (2010) caution that "An ecological perspective also warns against too easily reaching comprehensive, tidy findings" (p. 104). The intricacies of convergence and divergence of language ideologies within state language roadmaps were explored in three parts with emphasis on cultivating public awareness of language through education and conscientization, establishing neoliberal discourse through the language of economics, and locating the presence and absence of equity across the roadmap documents. Each of these conversations situate power in specific ways that lead to consequential implications for multilingual learners, educators and policy makers.

Promoting Linguistic Consciousness through Public Discourse

All of the eight state language roadmaps reviewed for this study advanced beliefs about the benefits of multilingualism in direct and indirect ways. By addressing specific affordances of multilingualism, the roadmaps assumed particular audiences for language education and language policy. Macro-level benefits related to economic development, national security and legal compliance reinforced institutional benefits of multilingualism while at the individual level, the roadmaps emphasized benefits related to relationships, cognition and overall well-being. The roadmaps converged in their call for greater language conscientization through public awareness campaigns and explicit marketing

efforts. Within this discourse, however, there were two distinct claims that emerged with regard to the current degree of public language consciousness. Some examples of text lamented limited public awareness while others argued for the existence of more abundant, broad-based awareness and support. While these claims are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the decision to advance one view over the other sets the stage for the next steps in policy design, development and implementation.

If the barrier to more effective and inclusive language education is limited awareness, then marketing campaigns address a salient need, while also potentially commodifying language by ascribing particular values to language and reinforcing specific beliefs about the benefits of multilingualism. If the challenge to advancing multilingualism is one not of awareness, but of action, then the policymaking space must attune to the politics of implementation, which raises a host of other concerns related to funding, leadership and sustainability. Both claims construct a particular vision of multilingualism by ascribing value to language development in alignment with other macro and micro social forces. Given the ongoing reification of systems of power and privilege within the domains of business, education and government, the process of value assignment is not benign. Promoting multilingualism as 'good for everyone' is not a panacea for linguistic discrimination and deficit-based orientations towards certain groups based on language status and race.

Absent conversations about the unequal distribution of the benefits of multilingualism, campaigns for greater linguistic conscientization will continue to reinforce language education policy that serves the interests of those in power. This

reproduction creates opportunities for change through interest convergence but falls short of enacting the subversive goals of language education described by some interview participants. The following section reviews the findings related to how the use of the language of economics in particular reinforces the broad social *Discourse* of neoliberalism with its concomitant impact on language education and policy.

The Role of Neoliberal Discourse in the Economics of Language

In narrowing the analytic focus of my research specifically to the domain of economics, I was able to identify how the language of economics is used throughout the roadmaps in ways that support the language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984) while also reinforcing specific neoliberal ideologies. In Chapter 5, I analyzed how multilingualism and language education are framed through the lens of competition, supply and demand, and opportunity cost. Through these discursive choices, language and language learners are positioned as commodities to be produced and exchanged for the benefits described in Chapter 4. Convergence on the economic value of language was accompanied by divergent implementational spaces related to linguistic speculation and linguistic generosity. These two discursive responses to the economic value of language illustrate once again the inequities in how the benefits of multilingualism are distributed across society.

On one hand, some roadmaps positioned language and language education as something worthy of significant financial investment. The texts of the language roadmaps and interviews with key state actors highlighted the realized returns on previous investments in language education. These discussions were accompanied by a desire to

engage in additional investment and speculation. Investment in language education, however, is a political choice that prioritizes certain languages and certain communities. Unless a disruptive and transformative view of equity is at the center of these decisions, the choices made in this speculative process will gravitate towards the status quo of power and privilege that has continued to maintain inequitable opportunities for access and inclusion. This risk is not ameliorated by a turn towards linguistic generosity, an assumption which can further exacerbate the inequitable appraisal of languages and language speakers.

When language is viewed as a public good that can and should be used for public benefit, language skills shift from being a speculative to an exploitative resource. If language speakers are expected to use their language skills for social benefit, opportunities for individual benefits can be diminished, especially with regard to the financial investments discussed earlier. The assumptions inherent in expectations of linguistic generosity also reveal beliefs about who can and should be compensated for language skills. The confluence of race and language through raciolinguistic ideologies create and amplify assumptions and expectations about the language skills of racialized individuals. These expectations have real consequences for lived experiences of racialized multilinguals.

Centering Equity in Language Education Policy

One of the challenges of locating equity within state language roadmaps is the evolution of public discourse related to issues of social justice. In Chapter 6, I attempted to contextualize the development of the language roadmaps, both with reference to the

historical period over which they were written, and the constraints that were placed around their development as a result of specific funding objectives and the particularities of stakeholder involvement. Although these factors lend themselves to a partial explanation of the presence and absence of themes related to equity within state language roadmaps, the importance of equity in education at the present moment compels continued critical discourse analysis. The roadmaps demonstrate a trajectory of increasing awareness from 2007 to 2019, but even within this evolution there are noticeable policy silences that undermine calls to advance linguistic conscientization and language education. Because of the hegemony of English and the ongoing invisibility of Eurocentric norms, equity is something that will not take care of itself and must be attended to intentionally in order to affect systemic change.

Although the roadmaps do emphasize the importance of expanding access and opportunities for language education within U.S. schools, there is limited mention of the historic role schools and educators have played in the eradication and erasure of indigenous and heritage languages. The absence of this discussion is compounded by limited exploration around the relationship between race and language. The inclusion and exclusion of conversations on heritage, indigenous and signed languages also reinforce a particular vision and audience for language education. Several of the roadmaps also reinforced the hegemony of English by uncritically naturalizing the English language as the de facto language of the United States. Given these findings, the following section discusses some of the implications of this work and offers recommendations for future research while also attending to researcher reflexivity.

Implications

Ajsic and McGroarty (2015) write that the success of language policies "depends in large measure on their congruence with the dominant language ideologies in circulation" (p. 182). Understanding the beliefs and orientations towards language that are operating through educational institutions is therefore an essential step in advancing education policy. This study contributes to language education policy and leadership by examining the ideologies that circulate through state language roadmap initiatives. The challenges of advancing multilingualism and the magnitude of marginalization that continues to occur for multilingual learners in classroom spaces underscore the importance for all actors in the field to continue exploring power dynamics of language policy and practice through critical and maieutic inquiry. Current monoglossic language ideologies occupy places of power and influence within both institutional and individual practices. Educational institutions reproduce and reify ideologies of power and privilege through the operationalization of language policy and planning.

Space for Agency and Activism

The field of language education policy scholarship has a long tradition of activism (Flores & Chaparro, 2018). It is within this tradition of activism that scholars and practitioners will be able to apply ideas from this research and access additional lines of inquiry. For the eight states with currently published roadmaps, this research can serve as an additional point of consideration in the ongoing work of implementation and potential revision. For states without roadmaps, this work maps out much of the process while raising awareness of potential opportunities for growth. Future roadmaps have the

opportunity to take up positions on the relationship between language with education, economics and equity. The ways in which states take up discourse on language conscientization, neoliberalism and social justice have the potential to reproduce or disrupt beliefs about language education and multilingualism.

The existence of alternatives at every level of the ecological model creates space for action and change (Clemens & Cook, 1999). While individual educational actors are inescapably situated within larger sociocultural institutions, all stakeholders embody agency and the potential for change. Educators and policy makers have an opportunity to work individually and collectively towards "the disinvention, rather than the reification of languages" (Pennycook, 2002, p. 26). Although monoglossic language ideologies still prevail in schools, more linguistically emancipatory alternatives within the teaching assemblage can be realized through individual agency and collective action. In addition to ideology, teacher agency is another factor that can drive de facto language policy (Nero, 2014). Even in the face of oppressive language ideologies, individuals have agency to resist ideology and disrupt the status quo. The following sections attune specifically to implications for classroom teachers by presenting opportunities to recognize and reposition teachers as policymakers within their schools.

Implications for Classroom Teachers

Early literature on language policy and planning did not address individual and community agency (Tollefson, 2010). Within an ecological model of language, however, language policy and planning necessarily includes local and micro-level language practices (Lo Bianco, 2010). As Hornberger and Johnson (2007) write, "[Policy] texts are

nothing without the human agents who act as interpretive conduits between the language policy levels" (p. 528). As a former teacher, it is important for me to articulate the implications that this work has for classroom teachers. To understand the ways in which micro-level actions are implicated in either the reproduction or dismantling of hegemonic language ideologies, this section examines how agency can be enacted in relation to state language policy by individual educators and educational institutions.

Policies can create space for interpretation and an overemphasis on the policies themselves shadows the ways in which local educators have agency in the interpretation and implementation of policies within their classrooms and schools (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). Johnson and Johnson (2015) define language policy arbiters as "individuals who have a disproportionate amount of impact on language policy and educational programs" (p. 222). The role that teachers play in language policy interpretation and implementation is unavoidable (Lo Bianco, 2010). Teachers have agency and capacity to validate certain language forms and to act as language policy arbiters within their classrooms (Lo Bianco, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2015). Teachers can support student language choices in many ways including the normalization of multilingual discourse in the classroom, and perhaps even drawing attention to the ways in which translanguaging occurs within school spaces (Durán & Palmer, 2014).

Language ideologies are especially important in the classroom setting because they influence the way that teachers view students (MacSwan, 2017) and, subsequently, the opportunities that students, especially multilingual learners, have within the classroom (Fuller, 2009). Unfortunately, research has consistently demonstrated that

content teachers are underprepared to serve multilingual learners (Motha, 2014). Current views of teacher development are often transactional in nature (Viesca et al., 2019), focusing on the acquisition of a certain set of skills and knowledge with limited attention to teacher dispositions and ideologies. When teachers approach language policy and practice within their classroom uncritically, they can unconsciously perpetuate and reproduce linguistics inequalities based on language (Shapiro, 2014). Monoglossic language ideologies consistently reinforce ongoing inequalities for multilingual learners, but this study calls into question uncritical promotion of multilingualism through language commodification as well as the unequal distribution of benefits related to linguistic speculation and linguistic generosity.

Teachers and School Leaders as Policy Makers

Research demonstrates that classroom teachers have agency as both language planners and policymakers (Lo Bianco, 2010; Menken & García, 2010; Motha, 2014). The individual choices teachers make within their classrooms become part of the process of linguistic and institutional change. New paradigms are needed to support teachers in shifting away from bounded and dichotomous language practices and towards a more dynamic framework of language architecture (Flores, 2020). Language educators need to develop critical language awareness by incorporating student language practices into the classroom and critiquing social constructions that delegitimize certain language practices (Flores & Rosa, 2015). Effective language pedagogy must attend to "inquiry, interaction, context, culture, discourse, and the tangible and intangible resources inside and outside the classroom" (Viesca et al., 2019, p. 310).

Within an ecological framework, ideologies of language must move beyond positioning linguistic differences as deficits, and beyond celebrating language differences without critical acknowledgement of the power dynamics present in language policies and practices (Motha, 2014). By taking up roles as critical language policy arbiters, teachers are able to initiate multi-level changes across the ecological framework presented in this study. Norms and choices in individual language use need to be developed and recognized as such because language use in the classroom ultimately shapes language change (Lo Bianco, 2010; Douglas Fir Group, 2016). Teachers and students have agency to resist the hegemony of English and normative monolingualism (Ramanathan, 2005; Fuller, 2009; Motha, 2014).

Principals and other district leaders also have an opportunity to play a critical role as language policy arbiters in educational settings. At an institutional level, principals are able to create or constrain the conditions that allow multilingualism to be naturalized. As school leaders, principals are responsible for myriad decisions related to staffing, funding, and instructional priorities. Choosing to hire multilingual teachers and staff, allocating funding to language access through translation and interpretation, and promoting programming that expands students' linguistic repertoires all contribute to a more multilingual ecology within the school. Because these decisions relate to the distribution of social goods, they are not without their challenges. As such, principals need to be prepared for inertial resistance that seeks to maintain the status quo and hegemony of English monolingualism.

With that said, the realization and enactment of agency does not always occur equally. Contexts can facilitate or constrain agency actions (Glazier & Hall, 1996). Educational institutions in particular frequently function as a barrier to critical consciousness and realization of agency (Davis, 2014). Within a school, or any other institution, actors are differentially disposed to engaging their agency towards institutional change (Clemens & Cook, 1999). Those with power and privilege in the system may be less likely to work towards systemic disruption because of the perceived identity costs associated with any change, and marginalized groups may be more likely to realize their agency because of the ways in which they have been denied the benefits from the current institutional policies and practices (Clemens & Cook, 1999). Awareness of this distinction requires critical self-reflection and awareness. The following section discusses my own reflexivity as a practitioner-scholar and the ways in which awareness of my own positionality supports deeper reflections on systems of power and privilege.

Researcher Reflexivity

Gal (1989) writes, "We are part of what we study" (p. 334). As a researcher, I have tried to keep this reflexivity in mind by recognizing the ways that my own positionality impacts my analysis and interpretation. In the process of presenting my interpretations, I recognize that my findings have also (re)produced certain discourses and perspectives. Instead of presenting my findings as an objective truth about state language roadmaps, my hope is that the analysis and interpretation I have presented here reflects new ways of thinking that have the potential to disrupt and transform the status quo. As I contribute my own thoughts and reflections to academia, I also pause to

consider the realities of epistemological hegemony. Kubota (2019) cautions against epistemological racism that privileges Euro-American ways of knowledge production and consumption. Within this pause, I want to draw attention to critical reflexivity offered by scholars of color (Kubota, 2019; Collins, 2000) to hold everyone in academia accountable not only for our words, but also for our actions.

This critical reflexivity requires questioning the coherence between my work as a scholar and my work as a practitioner. In addition, Kubota (2019) also urges more careful consideration of citation practices. Throughout this paper, I have been intentional about citing examples and frameworks proposed by scholars of color, specifically women of color. I also recognize that in spite of this intentionality, my work falls short in many ways. The entirety of works I cite are works published in English, neglecting entire bodies of knowledge published in other languages because of my own linguistic capacities. In addition, because of my own experiences with decades of schooling in Western-dominant traditions of knowledge production, a significant amount of my thinking has been influenced by Eurocentric perspectives. My complicitness in reproducing some of these Western-dominant frames of knowledge in my work as both a scholar and educator is not lost on me and will be an ongoing point of reflection as I continue in this work.

Invitation to Dialogue

A critical analysis of the discourse in and around state language roadmaps is not meant as an evaluation of the individuals and organizations who collaborated to fund, draft and publish the roadmaps. In the context of increasing political divisiveness, I

believe the greatest potential for change lies in calling in rather than calling out. By calling in, we invite dialogue and conversation. My hope is that this analysis is an opportunity for reflection both individually and collectively. On a personal level, this work has impelled me to revisit some of my own previous research and writing. Through new analytical frames, I can see how my own work has (re)produced some of the specific discourse presented here and I would be remiss to urge reflection on the work of others without acknowledging the need for reflection in my own life. The career I have built for myself has its foundation in the field of English language education, a field which continues to be implicated in the (re)production of discursive and material inequities. It is within this personal and collective reflection that I call into conversation a broader community of researchers, educators, businesspeople and community members to reimagine ways that we can talk about language and language education. Gee (2005) writes that, "The quality of research often resides in how fruitful our mistakes are: That is, in whether they open up paths on which others can then make more progress than we have" (p. 9). I hope that this work opens up new paths for continued research, and the following section introduces some of the potential avenues that could be pursued.

Future Research

In order for changes in educational policy to be successful in disrupting hegemonic language ideologies, continued attention needs to be paid to the interrelatedness of the discursive reproduction of particular ideologies with language policy interpretation and implementation. Towards this end, there are a number of generative opportunities for future research, including the opportunities to narrow the

scope of research through more local case studies and action research, to explore emergent themes from state language roadmaps in more detail and to shift the geopolitical focus to a more global context.

While this study has focused specifically on policy development and articulation at the state level, future research could narrow in on the interpretation and implementation of language education policy at more local levels through ethnographies of policy (e.g. Nero, 2014). A case study of a single state roadmap initiative, past or future, would lend itself to deeper discussions of how the cultural milieu plays a role in affecting policy design and implementation. Within the tradition of policy anthropology, researchers could ask additional questions about the effectiveness of different implementation strategies offered in the roadmaps, including what contextual factors led to the implementation of one policy over another, and why certain aspects of the language education policies proposed in the roadmaps have been able to achieve sustainability while others have yet to gain ground.

The scope of research could also be narrowed to examine how the language ideologies discussed in this study are taken up or resisted at the micro-level within classroom spaces. As a practitioner-scholar, I would love to see additional research operating at the nexus of policy and practice. Action research in language education programs could examine how the language ideologies discussed in this paper are reproduced or contested at various points throughout the language learning process. In order to move to a more decolonizing approach to action research, students and teachers

could be involved as co-equal partners in shaping the trajectory of the research process and in shaping the transformative ideals under which research is conducted.

Another direction for additional investigation could be a deeper exploration of some of the emergent themes from this study. Chapter 5 presented a conceptualization of linguistic generosity, an idea which could be examined in more detail, especially with relation to raciolinguistic ideologies in order to understand how race and other social features such as gender and class impact the degrees of compensation and contribution that are expected of people across different settings. Other emergent themes from the language roadmap research, including some which were not taken up within this paper, such as the role of credibility and leadership in advancing public language discourse could also be constructive possibilities for investigation.

Finally, future research could shift from the United States to a more global context by examining parallel nation-state language policies that advance multilingualism through education, business and government endeavors. Globally focused studies could compare the strategy recommendations as well as the underlying language ideologies that are reproduced in analogous documents. While certainly not exhaustive, I hope that these suggestions for future research spur thinking and dialogue that moves the conversation forward through continued affirmations and rebuttals of the work that I have shared here.

Conclusion

While cartographers have attempted for centuries to capture the shape of the world through two-dimensional maps, it is only by adding a third dimension to their work that we are able to appreciate the full scale and scope of our world. As a praxis-oriented

researcher, I have attempted to explore state language roadmaps through multiple perspectives to better understand language policy and ideology as represented in state language roadmaps. The Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative (2018) writes that "Languages matter because they are central to life and all it means to be human" (p. 3). My hope is that this study has affirmed the humanity of language by critically examining the way we talk about language and the role that language plays in shaping our world.

In exploring how education policy might be able to disrupt hegemonic language ideologies, this paper used an ecological framework to survey the assemblage of language ideologies in state language roadmaps. Beginning at the macro level of ideological structures, this paper outlined how language roadmaps were co-constructed with public discourse on language. Existing monoglossic language ideologies were presented in conversation with the hegemony of English and in contrast to the assemblage of benefits ascribed to multilingualism. Through discourse analysis, I analyzed how economic values shape language policy through the neoliberal commodification of language and how equity can be centered in language policy work.

By examining the power dynamics of language through multiple perspectives, this paper contributes to understanding the underlying language ideologies that complicate policy articulation and contribute to the ongoing marginalization of multilingual learners. This research compels careful consideration of agency and the role of teachers as policymakers within their classrooms and schools. Theorizing how education policy and practice can be used to disrupt hegemonic language ideologies is a complex and multifaceted endeavor. The theories and research presented here represent a coalescence

of scholarship and strategies from a multitude of researchers and practitioners, including myself, who seek to advance multilingualism and transform the school experiences for multilingual children, and I look forward to continuing conversations on this work.

Bibliography

Abdi, K. (2011). 'She Really Only Speaks English': Positioning, language ideology, and heritage language learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *67*(2):161. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.67.2.161

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness.* Duke University Press.

Ajsic, A & McGroarty, M. (2015). Mapping language ideologies. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning* (pp. 217-232). John Wiley & Sons.

Bartlett, L. & Vavrus, F. (2017). *Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach*. Routledge.

Beckert, J. (2010). Institutional isomorphism revisited: Convergence and divergence in institutional change. *Sociological Theory, 28*(2), 150-166. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01369.x

Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review, 93*(3), 518-533.

Björkman, B. (2014). Language ideology or language practice? An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua*, *33*(3-4), 335–363. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0016

Blommaert, J., Westinen, E., & Leppänen, S. (2015). Further notes on sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 12*(1), 119-127. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2015-0005

Bourdieu, P. & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.

Brecht, R. & Rivers, W. (2012). US language policy in defence and attack. In. B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 262-277). Cambridge University Press.

Brennan, S.C. (2018). Advocating commodification: An ethnographic look at the policing of Irish as a commercial asset. *Language Policy*, *17*, 157–177. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-017-9438-2

Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual practice as spatial repertoires: Expanding the paradigm beyond structuralist orientations. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 31-54. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041

Clemens, E. S., & Cook, J. M. (1999). Politics and institutionalism: Explaining durability and change. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*. 441-446. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.25.1.441

Collins, P. H. (2000) *Black feminist thought, knowledge, consciousness and pedagogy* (2nd Ed.). Routledge.

Cook, V., & Bassetti, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Language and bilingual cognition.* Psychology Press.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 103-115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

Darvin, R. & Norton, B. (2014). Transnational Identity and Migrant Language Learners: The Promise of Digital Storytelling. *Education Matters* 2(1), pp. 55-66.

Davis, K. (2014). Engaged language policy and practices. *Language Policy, 13*(2), 83-100. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-013-9296-5

Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methodology,* 8(2), 1-52. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800206

DeFina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. 'natural' contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society*, *40*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000849

Department of Defense (2005). *Defense language transformation roadmap*. https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/b313370.pdf

DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Douglas Fir Group (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal, 100*(S1), 19-47. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301

Dudley-Marling, C., & Lucas, K. (2009). Pathologizing the language and culture of poor children. *Language Arts, 86*(5), 362-370. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41483561

Durán, L., & Palmer, D. (2014). Pluralist discourses of bilingualism and translanguaging talk in classrooms. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 14*(3), 367-388. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798413497386

Eggington, W.G. (2010). Unplanned Language Planning. In Kaplan, & Kaplan, R. B. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0031

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London and New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). 'Political correctness': The politics of culture and language. *Discourse and Society 14*(1), 17-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926503014001927

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks.* Grove Press.

Flores, N. (2013). The unexamined relationship between neoliberalism and plurilingualism: A cautionary tale. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 500-520. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.114

Flores, N. (2020). From academic language to language architecture: Challenging raciolinguistic ideologies in research and practice. *Theory Into Practice, 59*(1), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1665411

Flores, N. & Chaparro, S. (2018). What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist Anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy, 17*(3), 365-384. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-017-9433-7

Flores, N., & García, O. (2017). A Critical Review of Bilingual Education in the United States: From Basements and Pride to Boutiques and Profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 14-29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190517000162

Flores, N. & Rosa. J. (*2015*) Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149-171. https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149

Fuller, J. (2009). Multilingualism in educational contexts: Ideologies and identities. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 3*(1), 338-358. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00101.x

Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345-367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.18.100189.002021

García, O. & Kleifgen, J.A. (2019). Translanguaging and Literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*(4), 553-571. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.286

Gee, J. (2004). Discourse analysis: what makes it critical? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 19-50). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

Gee, J. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis*: *A toolkit.* Routledge.

Glazier, J., & Hall, P. (1996). Constructing isomorphism in an interorganizational network. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 22*(2), 47-62.

Gogolin, I. (2013). The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam: A Journal of Language Learning, 13*(2), 38-48. https://doi.org/10.5785/13-2-187

Hannan, M., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. *American Sociological Review, 49*(2), 149-164.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*(1), 22-44.

Hawai‘i Language Roadmap Initiative. (2013). *Hawai‘i Language Roadmap Initiative: Bringing employers and educators together to shape Hawai‘i's future multilingual workforce.* http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/languageroadmap/

Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 473-92. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00238.x

Hornberger, N.H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy* (pp. 24-41). Blackwell Publishing.

Hornberger, N.H. & Johnson, D.C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509-532. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00083.x

Hornberger, N. (2015). Selecting appropriate research methods in LPP research: Methodological rich points. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning* (pp. 9-20). John Wiley & Sons.

Hult, F. M. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *202*, 7-24. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2010.011

Hyatt, S. B. (2011). What was neoliberalism and what comes next? The Transformation of citizenship in the law-and-order state. In C. Shore, S. Wright, & D. Però (Eds.), *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power*. Berghahn Books.

Indiana Language Roadmap Initiative. (2019). *Indiana language roadmap: Building a more global Indiana.* https://languageroadmap.indiana.edu/roadmap-plan/

Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The choice-within-constraints new institutionalism and implications for sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 525-546. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.525

Ives, P. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and global English: Language politics in globalization debates. *Political Studies*, *58*(3), 516-35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2009.00781.x

Jernudd, B., & Nekvapil, J. (2012). History of the field: A sketch. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Polic*y. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511979026.004

Johnson, D. C. (2015). Intertextuality and language policy. In F. M. Hult & D. Cassels Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning* (pp.166-180). John Wiley & Sons.

Johnson, D. C. & Johnson, E. J. (2015). Power and agency in language policy appropriation. *Language Policy, 14*(3), 221-243.

Kaplan, R. B., and R. B. Baldauf, Jr. (1997). *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters.

Kelly, L.B. (2017). Interest convergence and hegemony in dual language: Bilingual education, but for whom and why? *Language Policy*, *17*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9418-y

Koyama, J., & Varenne, H. (2012). Assembling and dissembling: Policy as productive play. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(5), 157-162. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12442799

Kramsch, C., & Huffmaster, M. (2015). Multilingual practices in foreign language study. In: J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.). *Multilingual education. Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 114–136). Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2019). Confronting epistemological racism, decolonizing scholarly knowledge: Race and gender in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 41*(5), 712-732. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz033

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 471–493. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264540

Lam, W., & Warriner, D. (2012). Transnationalism and Literacy: Investigating the Mobility of People, Languages, Texts, and Practices in Contexts of Migration. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(2), 191-215. https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.016

Language Flagship. (n.d.). *Flagship state language roadmaps.* www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/state-language-roadmaps

Language Flagship. (2017). *Request for Proposal: The Language Roadmap Initiative Application Guidelines.* Institute of International Education.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2012). Complex, dynamic systems: A new transdisciplinary theme for applied linguistics? *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 202-214. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000061

Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal, 103*(2), 348-370. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12568

Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1065-1122) Sage.

Lo Bianco, J. (2010). Language Policy and Planning. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education,* (pp. 143-176). Multilingual Matters.

Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. Review of Research in Education. 21. 3-47. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X021001003

MacSwan, J. (2017). A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935

Major, J. (2018). Bilingual Identities in Monolingual Classrooms: Challenging the Hegemony of English. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(2), 193-208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-018-0110-y

McGroarty, M. (2012). Home language: Refuge, resistance, resource? *Language Teaching*, *45*(1), 89-104. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000558

Menken, K., & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers.* Taylor & Francis.

Merriam, S., & Tisdell, E., (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Motha, S. (2014). *Race, empire, and English language teaching: Creating responsible and ethical anti-racist practice*. Columbia University.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2012). Ecology of Languages. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (2nd Ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0029

Mullet, D. R. (2018). A General Critical Discourse Analysis Framework for Educational Research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *29*(2), 116–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X18758260

National Security Education Program (NSEP) History. (n.d.). *History of NSEP.* https://www.nsep.gov/content/history

National Security Education Program (NSEP) Homepage (n.d.). *Welcome To The National Security Education Program.* https://www.nsep.gov/

National Security Education Program (NSEP) Initiatives (n.d.). *The Language Flagship.* https://www.nsep.gov/content/language-flagship

Ndimande, B. (2018). Unraveling the neocolonial epistemologies: Decolonizing research toward transformative literacy. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *50*(3), 383-390. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18784699

Nero, S. J. (2014). De facto language education policy through teachers' attitudes and practices: A critical ethnographic study in three Jamaican schools. *Language Policy*, *13*(3), 221–242. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-013-9311-x

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). Academic Press.

Ohio Language Roadmap Initiative. (2007). *Ohio Language Roadmap for the 21st century.* https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/language-roadmaps

Oregon Language Roadmap Initiative. (2007). *Language roadmap for the 21st century: Oregon.* https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/language-roadmaps

Orellana, M., & García, O. (2014). Conversation currents: Language brokering and translanguaging in school. *Language Arts, 91*(5), 386-392.

Pennycook, A. (2002). Mother tongues, governmentality, and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* (154), 11-28. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2002.009

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R.. (2006). Language policy and linguistic imperialism. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. (pp. 346-361). Blackwell Publishing.

Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education, 6*, 101–128. https://doi.org/10.5070/B86110060

President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (1979). Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Rajagopalan, K. (1999). Of EFL teachers, conscience, and cowardice. *ELT Journal, 53*(3), 200-206. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.3.200

Ramanathan, V. (2005). Rethinking language planning and policy from the ground up: Refashioning institutional realities and human lives. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 2*(2), 89-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200508668275

Rhode Island Language Roadmap Initiative. (2012). *The Rhode Island roadmap to language excellence.* http://rilanguage.weebly.com/

Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4*(2), 196-213. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00111

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosa, J. (2016). Standardization, racialization, languagelessness: Raciolinguistic ideologies across communicative contexts. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *26* (2), 162-183. https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12116

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, *8*(2), 15-34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Schwegler, T. (2011). Intimate knowledge and the politics of policy convergence: The World Bank and Social Security reform in Mexico. In C. Shore, S. Wright, & D. Però, (Eds). *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power* (pp. 130-150). Berghahn Books.

Shapiro, S. (2014). "Words that you said got bigger": English language learners' lived experiences of deficit discourse. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(4), 386-406.

Sharma, B.K. & Phyak, P. (2017). Neoliberalism, linguistic commodification, and ethnolinguistic identity in multilingual Nepal. *Language in Society*, *46*(2), 231-256. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000045

Shore, C., Wright, S., & Però, D. (2011). *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power*. Berghahn Books.

Spolsky, B. (2012). What is language policy? In. B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge University Press.

Subtirelu, N.C. (2017). Raciolinguistic ideology and Spanish-English bilingualism on the US labor market: An analysis of online job advertisements. *Language in Society*, *46*(4), 477-505. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000379

Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics, 32* (1), 25-42. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq027

Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 128-148. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000085

Texas Language Roadmap Initiative. (2007). *Texas language roadmap for the 21st century: Report of the Texas Language Summit at the University of Texas at Austin.* https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/language-roadmaps

Tollefson, J.W. (2010). Perspectives on language policy and planning. In Kaplan, R. B. (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0032

Tollefson, J.W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method.* (pp. 42-59). Blackwell Publishing.

Tollefson, J.W. (2015). Historical-structural analysis. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning* (pp.140-151). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118340349.ch13

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Utah Language Roadmap Initiative. (2009). *Utah language roadmap for the 21st century: Preparing the rising generation.* https://www.thelanguageflagship.org/content/state-language-roadmaps

Valdez, V. E., Delavan, G., & Freire, J.A. (2016). The marketing of dual language education policy in Utah print media. *Educational Policy*. *30*(6), 849-883. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814556750

Vandrick, S. (2014) The role of social class in English language education, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 85-91, https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2014.901819

Viesca, K., Strom, Hammer, Masterson, Linzell, Mitchell-Mccollough, & Flynn. (2019). Developing a complex portrait of content teaching for multilingual learners via

nonlinear theoretical understandings. *Review of Research in Education, 43*(1), 304-335. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18820910

Wang, Y. (2016). Homology and isomorphism: Bourdieu in conversation with New Institutionalism. *British Journal of Sociology, 67*(2), 348-370. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12197

Wisconsin Language Roadmap Initiative. (2018). *The Wisconsin language roadmap: Investing in language education for a world-ready Wisconsin.* https://wisconsinlanguageroadmap.wisc.edu/

Yanow, D. (2011). A Policy ethnographer's reading of policy anthropology. In C. Shore, S. Wright, D. Però, (Eds). *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power*. Berghahn Books.

Wiley, T. & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, *30*(3), 511-35. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587696

Woolard, K.A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B.B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P.V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp. 3-50) Oxford University Press.

Wood, D., Kaiser, W. & Abramms, B. (2006). *Seeing through maps: Many ways to see the world*. ODT Maps, Inc.

Wortham, S., Mortimer, K., Lee, K., Allard, E., & White, K.D. (2011). Interviews as interactional data. *Language & Society*, 40, 39-50.

Wright, S. & Reinhold, S. (2011). 'Studying through': A strategy for studying political transformation. Or sex, lies and British politics. In C. Shore, S. Wright, & D. Però, (Eds.). *Policy worlds: Anthropology and the analysis of contemporary power*. Berghahn Books.

Appendix A: Timeline of Language Policy with Stated Goals

Policy Document	Year	Stated Mission, Vision or Goal(s)
Defense Language Transformation Roadmap	2005	Post 9/11 military operations reinforce the reality that the Department of Defense needs a significantly improved organic capability in emerging languages and dialects, a greater competence and regional area skills in those languages and dialects, and a surge capability to rapidly expand its language capabilities on short notice (p. 1)
U.S. Language Summits: Ohio Language Roadmap for the 21st Century	2007	Ohio businesses, government agencies, and educational institutions will collaborate to create a multilingual workforce by developing and launching innovative programs. These initiatives will assure Ohioans of opportunities to gain advanced knowledge of foreign languages and cultures in conjunction with job-related technical and academic knowledge (p. 2)
Language Roadmap for the 21st Century: Oregon	2007	The Oregon Roadmap to Language Excellence strives to create the conditions that will allow every Oregon graduate to be professionally proficient in English and functionally proficient in another language by 2025. As this goal is achieved, Oregon will become a place where every guest feels welcome and every citizen can contribute to the social, economic, and cultural life of the state (p. 1).
Texas Language Roadmap for the 21st Century: A Report of the Texas Language Summit	2007	The objective of this report, *Language Roadmap for the 21st Century: Texas*, is to identify the conditions that will lead to advanced linguistic and cultural proficiency in a language other than English for all students graduating from Texas high schools by 2027 (p. vi).
Utah Language Roadmap for the 21st Century: Preparing the Rising Generation	2009	The shared vision of three Utah events emphasizes the goal of creating a dynamic language education structure to support the development of a highly skilled and advanced multilingual student population focusing on professional competence in at least one world language other than English, preferably two. The goal is linguistic

		facility coupled with the ability to use language in an advanced professional and cultural context (p. 4)
Rhode Island Roadmap to Language Excellence	2012	The State of Rhode Island strives to create a multilingual, culturally savvy, globally competent Rhode Island community and workforce by creating well-articulated language learning programs emphasizing proficiency and biliteracy. By 2030, the majority of Rhode Island graduates will be proficient in English and at least one other language (p. i).
Hawai'i Language Roadmap Initiative: Bringing Employers and Educators together to Shape Hawai'i's Future Multilingual Workforce	2013	Through these proposals, we hope to identify those paths by which the nascent capacity of Hawai'i's linguistic, cultural, and human resources can develop into a world-class workforce that serves the language needs and fuels the economic aspirations of Hawai'i for the 21st century (p. iii).
America's Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century	2017	In this report, the Commission on Language Learning recommends a national strategy to improve access to as many languages as possible for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background—that is, to value language education as a persistent national need similar to education in math or English, and to ensure that a useful level of proficiency is within every student's reach. As children prove especially receptive to language education—they spend much of their time in educational settings and can develop language skills gradually throughout their lives—the Commission believes that instruction should begin as early in life as possible. Its primary goal, therefore, is for every school in the nation to offer meaningful instruction in world languages as part of their standard curricula (p. viii)
Wisconsin Language Roadmap: Investing in Language Education for a World-Ready Wisconsin	2018	The Wisconsin Language Roadmap is a call for collaborative action to enhance the economic competitiveness of the State of Wisconsin and to meet the language and cultural demands of Wisconsin's workforce and communities by strengthening language education in our state. Implementing the Language Roadmap's recommendations will pave the way to a world-ready Wisconsin through the ongoing

		development of the language, intercultural and global competencies of all Wisconsin students (p. ii).
Indiana Language Roadmap: Building a More Global Indiana	2019	The Indiana Language Roadmap Initiative aims to make high quality world language instruction and training in global skills available, equitable, and affordable to all Indiana residents (p. 2).

Appendix B: Section One of the 2017 Language Flagship Request for Proposals

Language Flagship. (2017). *Request for Proposal: The Language Roadmap Initiative Application Guidelines.* Institute of International Education.

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

The Institute of International Education (IIE), acting as the administrative agent of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) for The Language Flagship, seeks proposals from current Undergraduate Domestic Flagship Programs for Flagship support in establishing or reinforcing and strengthening a Language Roadmap. This solicitation is open to U.S. institutions of higher education (IHEs) hosting current Undergraduate Domestic Flagship Programs.

THE LANGUAGE FLAGSHIP

The Language Flagship is a national effort to change the way Americans learn languages. Flagship Programs work to systematically produce a pool of language-proficient professionals to meet the need for language and culture expertise critical for national and economic security.

The Language Flagship is a partnership between the Department of Defense and U.S. IHEs with the mission of creating new models of language learning that produce college graduates with professional-level (Interagency Language Roundtable level 3 (ILR 3)) proficiency in Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, and Turkish. Domestic Flagship Programs develop articulated language learning pathways to guide students from all majors and language backgrounds through formal instruction and guided interventions toward advanced-level language proficiency. Overseas Flagship Centers provide directed language instruction, direct enrollment opportunities and professional internship experiences that foster the attainment of professional level language proficiency during an overseas Capstone year experience.

In addition to the core Flagship program, The Language Flagship sponsors the following initiatives to promote and improve U.S. students' language learning and cultural expertise:

- K-12 Initiatives;
- African Flagship Languages Initiative;
- South Asian Flagship Languages Initiative;
- Proficiency Initiative;
- Flagship Technology Innovation Center; and
- State Language Roadmaps.

These additional initiatives and programs allow Flagship to develop language resources, strengthen the K-12 language pipeline and make key investments that foster the adoption of proficiency testing, meaningful technology use, advanced level teaching and teacher preparation, and enhanced opportunities for students to fulfill federal government service.

The objectives of the Flagship State Language Roadmap Initiative are to:

- Delineate current and future language and cultural skills needed for a competitive workforce that can function locally and globally;
- Examine state and local needs for language proficiency in the workforce (public and private sector), and corresponding state and local capacity to train qualified graduates;
- Build connections between state and local government, academia, and industry in addressing language needs and capacity;
- Increase public understanding of the importance that language plays in workforce readiness;
- Identify and address how state and local government, and public and private education in the state can increase or adjust resources to meet local, state and national needs;
- Identify and address barriers and challenges to meeting state needs (e.g. teacher training and certification, resources, coordination; tracking of language enrollments and outcomes);
- Increase the pipeline of students graduating with language proficiency for entry into Language Flagship and other federal language, culture and international studies programs, or government and military careers; and
- Create a state-specific Language Roadmap document to articulate a plan forward for a statewide effort to address language needs and capacity, with consensus from state and local government, educators, and the private sector.

FUNDING FOR FLAGSHIP LANGUAGE ROADMAP INITIATIVE

Institutional funding will be administered by IIE, which anticipates making three cost reimbursable awards of up to $100,000 for the first year of funding for a new State Roadmap, and up to $60,000 for a second year or up to $60,000 for one year for a continuation project. Funding is contingent on the successful review and approval of an institution's response to this solicitation and the availability of funds. Support will be made available in one-year increments contingent upon satisfactory program performance, the review and approval of annual budgets, and the availability of funds.

Funding levels will vary depending on program performance and funding availability. NSEP expects each Language Roadmap Initiative to develop a plan of execution and longer-term sustainment strategies as a component of the initial submission.

PROJECT TIMELINES

IIE expects to make awards over a total of two (2) years, for periods of 12 months each, beginning on or around June 1, 2017. Applicants will address important outcomes and timetables in their proposals for the following periods: Project Year 1: June 1, 2017 – May 31, 2018 Project Year 2: June 1, 2018 – May 31, 2019

PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND OUTCOMES

NSEP and IIE will monitor program performance throughout the 2017-2019 award cycle through reviews of annual program and quarterly financial reports, and through site visits. Performance measures and outcomes for the 2017-2019 Roadmap cycle include:

- Publication of a State Language Roadmap that incorporates input from state and local government, education sector, and private sector;
- Evidence of progress toward language capacity goals (e.g. Seal of Biliteracy, teacher training and certification, establishment of new or improved language programs, private sector engagement); and
- Successful review achieved during onsite sponsor visit(s).

Appendix C: Proposed Policy and Practice Recommendations

Education	OH	OR	TX	UT	RI	HI	WI	IN
Integrating world languages with content classes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promoting study abroad and international exchange through incentives or policy changes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-
Developing and expanding pre-service teacher training and certification programs	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extending opportunities for and sequences of language study	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Incentives for model / innovative language programs (start-up funding, subsidized salaries, awards)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-
Developing online training and courses for language and culture	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promoting teacher recruitment and retention (including incentives such as scholarship support, loan forgiveness, salary premiums, step increases, promotions)	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Enhanced diplomas or language proficiency certificates	Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Providing additional in-service teacher training	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promoting internationalization of teaching force (scholarships for travel, teacher exchange programs, inviting international guest teachers)	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes

Education *(continued)*	**OH**	**OR**	**TX**	**UT**	**RI**	**HI**	**WI**	**IN**
(Re)development of world language curriculum and materials	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-
Expanding teacher recruitment and providing alternative licensure options for world language teachers	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Secondary or postsecondary credit for demonstrated language proficiency	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	Yes	-
Options for dual credit language programming	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shifting K-12 language studies from enrichment to core	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	-
Developing or revising state standards or benchmarks in world languages	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-
Providing training for school personnel, including guidance counselors and/or administrators	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes
Tuition rebates or scholarships for language proficiency	Yes	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-
Developing language assessments for students and professionals	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Encouraging dual licensure of teachers at postsecondary level	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	-	-
Requiring world language for university admission	-	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-
Encouraging international students	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-

Businesses	**OH**	**OR**	**TX**	**UT**	**RI**	**HI**	**WI**	**IN**
Internship opportunities for secondary and /or postsecondary students to use language skills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Consulting, training and outreach services for business and community organizations related to language and culture	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Language proficiency database to connect employers and employees and share resources	Yes	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes
Incentives for multilingual employees (salary premiums, promotions)	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Providing employee incentives for work abroad	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Adding language requirements to critical fields like emergency services	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Incentives for business that invest in language proficiency	-	-	Yes	-	-	Yes	-	-
Government	**OH**	**OR**	**TX**	**UT**	**RI**	**HI**	**WI**	**IN**
Public outreach and communication on the benefits of multilingualism	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
A coordinating entity (an “office”, “center”, “board” or “council”)	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outreach and advocacy with policymakers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes
Information and resource clearinghouse related to language and culture	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes

Government *(continued)*	**OH**	**OR**	**TX**	**UT**	**RI**	**HI**	**WI**	**IN**
Creating networking opportunities and learning communities	Yes	-	-	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Building relationships with sister cities or schools	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-
Providing training opportunities and/or system of certification for interpreters and translators	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Supporting ongoing, further research	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coordinated access to translated materials and interpretation services	Yes	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-
Incentives to families for hosting international exchange students	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	-	-	-
Creating a “Language Corps” program for public language service	-	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-
Offering a language-based visa status	-	-	-	-	-	Yes	-	-
Auctioning language education bonds to raise funding	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix D: Letter of Informed Consent

June 8, 2020

Dear Participant:

I am completing a dissertation in Education Policy and Leadership at the University of Minnesota. As part of my graduate work, I plan to conduct research during the Summer and Fall of 2020. The purpose of my letter is to ask your permission to take part in my research. The abstract and final product will be public scholarship and will be cataloged in the University of Minnesota's library system, a searchable electronic repository. I may also share, publish, or use my findings in other public and scholarly ways in the future.

My research will be based on interviews with participants and leaders in multiple state Language Roadmap initiatives from 2007 to 2019. I want to explore the origin, development, and recommendations in published language roadmaps as well as the specific discourses about language and multilingualism that have been part of the accompanying initiatives. Because of the dynamic and occasionally nonlinear nature of research, the focus may shift throughout the writing process. If you choose to participate in my research, you will be asked to take part in a virtual or telephone interview. Your identity will be protected. No real names or identifying characteristics will be used. All findings will remain confidential. You may also decide not to participate at any time without any negative consequences.

Different states have used diverse approaches to encourage multilingualism. This research will benefit state policymakers and leaders in business and education by presenting an overview of the language planning, policies and practices used by different states. Findings of this research may be used by individuals in other states to inform their own language roadmap initiatives. All interview participants will receive a summary of Findings at the conclusion of this research.

I have received permission to do this research from the University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board. If you agree to participate, please keep this document for your reference. If you have any questions, please contact me with the information below.

Sincerely,
Ashley Karlsson
E-Mail: karl0173@umn.edu

Appendix E: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Can you describe your role in the language roadmap initiative?
2. What was the goal of this initiative?
3. How much time was invested in the development of the roadmap?
4. In what ways, if any, was the roadmap initiative informed by earlier language roadmap initiatives?
5. What kinds of references to other states, if any, were made in discussions about the language roadmap?
6. What are some of the successes of the language roadmap initiative?
7. What challenges needed to be addressed during the language roadmap initiative?
8. Is the state on track to reach goals described in the roadmap?
9. How might the roadmap look different if it were drafted today?
10. When thinking about the roadmap process, what similarities or differences, if any, might you expect for future language roadmap initiatives?
11. What advice would you give to other states who are considering drafting their own language roadmaps?
12. Were there any questions you wanted me to ask that I have not yet asked?